A

REVIEW

OF

Dr. *Zachary Grey's*

DEFENCE

OF OUR

ANCIENT and MODERN

HISTORIANS.

WHEREIN,

Inſtead of dwelling upon his frivolous Cavils, falſe Quotations, unjuſt Inferences, *&c.* it is prov'd, (to his Glory be it ſpoken) That there is not a Book in the *Engliſh* Tongue which contains ſo many *Falſhoods* in *ſo many Pages.*

Non vitioſus Homo es, Zacary, ſed Vitium.

By the Author of the *Critical Hiſtory of* England, *Eccleſiaſtical and Civil*, &c.

LONDON: Printed for J. ROBERTS, in *Warwick-Lane.* 1725.

Price 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

THE PREFACE

I Little thought, when I ſet about writing the *Critical Hiſtory*, that I was entring upon a Controverſy; if I had, I ſhould have left the Work to Perſons of greater Genius and Leiſure. As I was ſure of the Truth and Sincerity of the Deſign, how could one imagine that there was ſuch a Creature in being, who, with a bare Face, would ſet himſelf in Oppoſition to Both, and defend *Falſhood and Arrogance* againſt them! I ſaw no Danger in telling plain Fact, and making fair Remarks upon it; and as my Inten-

tion was only to put common Readers of *English* History in the right Road, out of which so many blind and false Guides were ready to turn them, I could not apprehend that so useful an Undertaking would have been liable to any Exception. I should have been pleas'd with good Observations, and decent Correction, had it been possible for a Man of the least Sense and Honour, to have encounter'd Fact and Truth. I should have treated him like a Gentleman, own'd, and amended all the Errors he had prov'd upon me, and been much oblig'd to him for whatever Instruction or Improvement I had got from him; but for such a Man as *Zachary Grey*, who falls upon me without either Conscience or Understanding, who is insensible of Modesty and good Manners; 'tis a sad Thing to have to do with him tho' but for once. I would not do it again were I to get as much *Fame* by it as Mr. *Echard* has got by his Histories. To argue with Men of Doctor *Grey*'s Character, is as *Dryden* said of answering *Powel* the Player, and that is too filthy to be repeated. This Doctor, of whom I know little but by his Works, has nothing to risk in such Contests, and therefore he stakes boldly in Words; when the Game is against him he'll sneak off, and care not what People say of him. It can't well be worse with him than it is. I am ashamed of his Company, and

will get rid of it as fast as I can. I never so much as heard of him till he was in Print, and I did not think it worth while to enquire after him. They tell me, without it, there was a Man of his Two Names at *Cambridge*, but *neither his Parts nor his Family rendered him notable:* Another informs me, *there was a* Tory or Jacobite *Parson in* Lincolnshire, of his Christian and Sir-Name. All which agree exactly with the Stile and Sentiments of his Writings, They being both rude and seditious. I was *bit* when I undertook him, but I will not be bitten again by any such Doctors. They may scribble on, *Offend* and *Defend*, I'll be be so far from answering, that I will read them no more; and thank my Stars, my Distance from them puts me out of the Reach of their Scandal and Insolence, their Libels not living long enough to travel Forty Leagues. I may say to them, what Bishop *Blackall* said to the Right Reverend and Learned the present Bishop of *Salisbury*, *I have no Leisure, and I will have no Leisure*, to enter into Debate with them. Those of them that know any Thing of good History, which God knows very few of them do, sin against Light, when they write against our *Parliamentary* Constitution in Church and State, and therefore don't deserve to be talk'd to: Those that are entirely ignorant, believe their Teachers implicitly, and are

incapable of Conviction; to these one would also have nothing to say. But if any well-dispos'd Reader has any Doubt or Scruple upon him, as to the Truth or Reason of any one Assertion in the *Critical History*, let him leave it with the Bookseller, and he shall have full Satisfaction. This Method I have taken on the like Occasions, and will continue it on this; such Answerers as Dr. *Zachary* being below either Cognizance or Contempt, and I'll deal with him no more in Form.

Before I leave this Subject, I must add a Word or Two, not to satisfy Dr. *Grey*, or any of that Herd, but in Compliance with the Desire of some Friends, who were willing to be referr'd more particularly to the Author and Page in my Quotations. I wrote a Letter concerning it some Months ago, and shall take out of it as follows. "I "expect a Clamour will be made about my "omitting the Page sometimes, and some-"times the Author; for which I had more "Reasons than one. The first, and most "substantial, was, that I wrote the Book "in the Country, where I had not many "Helps, and that in less than *Seven Weeks* "Time, *tho'* Dr. Zachary *affirms I was* "*SEVEN YEARS about it.* The Au-"thorities I made use of were from a *Com-*"*mon Place* of some hundreds of Sheets, "collected by my self out of some hundreds

"of

" of Authors in ten Years constant Reading,
" wherein the Author's Name heads every
" Article, but the particular Page is too of-
" ten omitted. However, I propos'd no-
" thing to my self in that Collection, but
" to assist my Memory upon a vast Variety
" of Subjects; and therefore it could not
" enter into my Head to falsify the Text,
" neither do I know of one Word or Sylla-
" ble added or omitted in one Quotation,
" out of many thousands. In the second
" Place, if I had had Recourse again to the
" Originals themselves, besides that I had
" not Patience or Opportunity for so tedious
" an Employment, I thought the Gainsayer
" would surely make an ill Use of 'em, and
" by falsifying and corrupting the Text, as
" *Dr.* Zachary *has done*, to turn my own Ar-
" tillery against me. Further, as I had ne-
" ver a great Opinion of such Writers as the
" Doctor, either as to their Honesty or Ca-
" pacity, so I resolv'd not to direct them
" to my Authorities, but to puzzle 'em,
" and lay a Temptation in their Way to
" assert boldly there are no such Authorities
" at all. *The* Doctor *has fallen into the*
" *Snare, and made eight or ten such false As-*
" *sertions, by which one may take Measure*
" *of his Understanding and Conscience.*

" Again, I certainly had as much Right
" to abridge my Work, by omitting the
" *Page*, the *Edition*, &c. as the Archdeacon
" had.

"had. I was *rectus in Curia*, and had ne-
"ver given Occasion by *Misrepresentations*,
"*Prevarications*, *False Glosses*, and *False*
"*Facts*, to render my self suspected. My
"Word might be taken till I was convicted
"of Offences, especially since Mr. *Echard*,
"after he had written the two wonderful
"Reigns of King *James* I. and King *Charles* I.
"demands the same Privilege in his last *Pre-*
"*face*, wherein he *doubts not his Readers*
"*will have so good an Opinion of his* Judg-
"ment *and* Honesty, *as not to expect every*
"*Sentence to be supported by a particular Au-*
"*thority*.

The only Objection made by Dr. *Grey*, or some Body for him, which has in it the least Sign of *Sense* or *Discretion*, is a Remark on the Title of the *Critical History*, which that Author had often made before, as being too *presuming*. He never lik'd it himself, but he cou'd not think of any other which wou'd excite People's Curiosity, or express his Intention so well. Besides, as he wou'd have kept himself *incog*, if he cou'd, he might have pass'd on the Stage for a Critick, as well as *W*—— for a Wit. If at any Time he *overbears* a little, it is when he fancies he is writing to such dull Mortals as our *Doctor*; he's always ready to submit to Men of Learning, Judgment, and Manners, but will by no Means truckle to Dr. *Zachary* or his Historian, who have

both

both insolently enough requir'd Homage from him as his Superiors. The same Submission do they demand for *Heylin*, *Mulson*, *Collier*, *Walker* of *Exon*, *Wagstaffe*, *Simons*, and others: Can there be a greater Affront than to roll a Man below themselves and such a String of Authors? How does he or his Historian know, but that the *Critical Historian*'s House and Land had the same Boundaries, and the same Name for their Owner, 6 or 700 Years ago as they have now, to borrow from one of our merry Papers? If it should happen to be so, he will have a hard Matter to make good his *Superiors*, especially among such Lovers of Antiquity, as the Disciples of *Dugdale*, &c.

This modest good Man in his *Preface* upbraids the *Critical Historian* with being a *Common Hackney Writer*, which his *Historian* should, methinks, have rebuk'd him for; because the Market is as open for one Man as another; and his Friend has been a considerable Trader. The Author of the *Critical History* liv'd too far out of it to have any Gain in View: However, he thinks it no Disgrace to do what was done by Mr. *Addison*, and Mr. *Steele* before him, and what *Boileau* calls,

Tirer de son travail un tribut Legitime.

In this Case he had no Concern upon him, but the Publick Good; and the Reception

his

his Undertaking has met, is answerable to so generous a Design. Besides, it would have been a very bad Bargain for the Bookseller, when Dr. *Zachary* tells the World the Book is at the *Pastry Cooks*. I believe he is himself free from any such Censure, and cannot justly be charg'd with taking Money for his Copy.

Most Part of his excellent Preface is borrow'd from the Author whom he abuses, and so in every thing in him that but squints at *Wittiism*.

He assures us, that *Brady* was no Party-Man, and that his Books sell like Bread. He couples him with Mr. *Echard* to make two *Valuable Historians*, Men of *Courage* and *Honesty*; Men of *Leisure*, *Abilities*, and *Integrity*; Men that did neither *Varnish* nor *Colour*: Whereas all the *Whig Authors* (see his *Preface*) wear Masks, and carry the Truth about in a Dark Lanthorn. He has an old Saw or two in the same admirable Piece, as the *Shoulders of Hercules*, and the *Augean Stable*, which are some of the Tools made use of by School-Boys; indeed he has hardly brought off a few Scraps of the Refuse of *College Wit*; and his Soil is so barren, 'tis incapable of Culture. Mr. *Echard* must needs reckon himself oblig'd to him for linking him with Dr. *Brady*; and I can never enough acknowledge my Obligations to him for not having given me one good Word,

which

which might have render'd me ſuſpected to every honeſt and wiſe Man. As ſoon as I ſaw his Book advertis'd, I knew what a poor Creature he muſt be by the Title; there's ſcarce a Bookſeller's Boy in *London* but cou'd have patch'd up a better for him. Every *Grub* cou'd have told him, that among them it had been long out of Faſhion to call *Cavils* Frivolous, *Quotations* Falſe, and *Inferences* Unjuſt, being all Words of Courſe, and all Writers whatever are *Pretenders* to all *Anſwerers* whatever. If he had had a Friend in the World, or if his Printer had had any Value for him, they wou'd not have ſuffer'd him to have put his noble Name to ſuch a ſorry Title-Page.

To have done with him *for now and for ever*, let the Faction have *Sophiſtry*, *Bigottry*, *Falſhood*, and *Inſolence* on their Side, it will be the Fault of thoſe whom it concerns, if they have Hiſtory, which bears every Word againſt them.

I met with a Paragraph lately in an *Occaſional Paper*, N. 8. *p.* 13. which agrees exactly with Dr. *Zachary*'s Morals, Manner, and Merit; "The late Debates among our Diſ-"putants have baſely degenerated into "Scolding. 'Tis an Obſervation in thoſe at "*Billinſgate*, that whoever firſt calls *Whore* "or *Rogue*, has the worſt Side of the Argu-"ment; So when Divines enter the Liſts, "'tis a ſhrewd Sign who are the weakeſt, "when

" when Recourſe is had to Slander and Ca-
" lumny. No Reaſon can be aſſigned why
" a Man's private Conduct or perſonal Cha-
" racter, ſhould be brought into a Contro-
" verſy, but either a politick View of taking
" away the Force of an Argument, by raiſing
" an ill Opinion of him, that urges it, or
" elſe to give Vent to Spight and Ill nature.
" In either Caſe, 'tis a Conduct that ſpeaks
" a Meanneſs of Spirit, and a little Soul."
The very Doctor *himſelf, the very Original, and as like as if it was intended for him!* " But
" when, to ſerve either of theſe, a Man will
" forge, or utter, or be pleaſed with a LYE,
" only to render his Adverſary infamous, this
" is *Villany* added to *Spite*. If therefore a
" Chriſtian Man, thro' the powerful Influence
" of any bad Principle, has become guilty
" of flinging Dirt himſelf upon his Adverſary's
" Character, or of lending Scandal to ano-
" ther, it becomes him, eſpecially when
" *Falſhood* aggravates the *Defamation*, to do
" what he can to wipe off the Scandal, and
" repair the Injury. To ſtand out in a *Lying*
" Story, *&c.* Whoever has a Mind to ſee more of this delicate and humane Manner of Writing, may find it *p.* 18. *& ſeq.* from the Pens of three famous *Doctors*, and all in Injury to the Reputation of a pious and learned Prelate. Dr. *Zachary Grey* has all theſe excellent Qualities; and tho' I doubt not the Archdeacon is as well qualify'd, yet to ſhew

how

how much I am in Peace with him, I lay this Picture before him, to assist him when he sets about considering the *Critical Historian*.

There is no Man can have a worse Opinion than I have of any Cause supported by Scurrility and Impudence. The most daring Falsities have been asserted by a Set of Men, whose Work it is, or ought to be, to teach Integrity and Truth. Too many of 'em are so low bred, that they have had nothing to refine 'em but a Charity Education, of which they make little other Use than to learn to insult their *Superiors*, and sometimes their very Patrons and Benefactors: I could give a pleasant Instance or two of this, but I avoid out of Respect to a great Number of worthy Men, who perhaps may be scandalized by it. Their lower Schools, lately very much cry'd up and preach'd up, are lamentable Lessons of this kind too, and Care is taken to poyson and corrupt Posterity to justify the Corruption and Infection of the present Age. I cannot well be charged with Indecency of Expression, considering the Provocation and the Subject. A Man of our Doctor's Forehead and Intellects is not to be treated with Smiles and soft Airs; and if I wanted no other Excuse, his own vile Example would be sufficient. He never saw or heard of the Author of the *Critical History*, yet he gives him the Lye in several Places, without the least Reason, treats him as a Blockhead and a

Scoun-

Scoundrel, and 'twill be very hard if that Hiſtorian ſhould be cenſur'd for not ſtanding with his Hat off to a Perſon who rather deſerv'd a Drubbing than a Review. The Reader is deſir'd to be merciful to ſuch Faults as have eſcap'd the Preſs on Account of the Writers great Diſtance from it, and not like Dr. *Grey*, condemn him in a Harangue of two or three Pages, for a Printer's Boy's putting *Of* in a wrong Place; yet that is the moſt judicious, and the moſt honeſt Obſervation of his in the whole *Defence* of our Ancient and Modern Hiſtorians, from *Nennius* down to *Salmon*, many of whoſe Names are a Diſgrace to all Hiſtory.

A REVIEW OF Dr. Zachary Grey's DEFENCE, &c.

I Shall imitate Dr. *Grey* in one Thing, and without any farther Ceremony than, *Sir, Your most obliged humble Servant*, come directly to his Book.

He tells you, *p.* 1. *He has not many Exceptions to the Two first Chapters of the* Critical History; in which there are more Criticisms than in all the rest. The Reason is plain enough. He does not understand them; if he did, I know by his Civility and Capacity, we should surely have heard of 'em. His

His first Quotation is so unfairly represented, that I might have call'd it something else if I would. He indeed makes use of the Word *Lye*, as well as the Thing; but I never had his Opportunities to improve in such Language. Page 2. *The whole Story of* Brute, *and his Posterity, was without Doubt invented, and yet He* (Crit. Hist.) tells us, *That from his Posterity we may learn what Notions the ancient* Britons *had of the Rights of Prince and People, by the Actions attributed to them.* He leaves out what follows, and immediately makes this idle and unjust Inference; "So that notwith-"standing the Story is a meer Fiction, yet when "it can be wire-drawn to do Service to his dar-"ling and favourite Hypothesis, He will then "be willing to adopt it into his History." My next Words, in the same Paragraph, which he has maliciously omitted, explain the Former: *The* Moral *of every Fable is as much a Lesson as if the Story had not been invented; what is said to have been done, if Good, ought to have been done; and, on the contrary, what is Bad, to be avoided.* He misquotes me in the same Page: *The* Britons *set aside* Androgas *purely on Account of his being in the Interest of the Invaders*, viz. *the* Romans; which later Words are not mine; and there being a Meaning in them, I am inclined to think they are not his own, but Somebodies else. The *Romans* are there added, to insinuate that our Invaders, the modern *Romans*, only come to bring us the Right Heir; and *that there's nothing*, as He says, *in the History that favours of the People's Right to set aside their King*, notwithstanding *Sammes*, in his *Britannia*, informs us, how well he deserved it, as *being Cæsars great Instrument, in giving him Light in many Things that conduced to the Ruin of his Country.* These are the Princes for whom our *Law*-Doctor is an Advocate. I shall avoid as much as I can to bully

bully him with the *Constitution*, tho' such Men as He insult others with the *Church*; and tho' nothing in the World can be plainer than that the whole Bent of their Works and Writings is to promote Spiritual and Temporal Tyranny, in Complacency to the Pretender and his Religion.

Page 5, 6. He labours to prove, that *Vortigern*, King of the *Britons*, *was not deposed, but only gave up to his Son* Vortimer. *We have no Account of his* Deposition. Twice does He assure us of this Falsity, and accuses me of *Misrepresentation*: And twice was the same King *deposed*, tho' He so positively affirms the contrary. Dr. *Hody* uses the very Word, *Conv. p.* 15. and *Matt. Westm.* speaking of the Council that deposed him, tells us, they chose *Aurelius Ambrosius* King, *Aurelium in Regem Erexerunt*. *Sammes* says of his former *Deposition*, *The* Council *bereav'd Him of his Power and Dignity, and* placed *Vortimer* in his Stead.

In the Introduction to the first Volume of Mr. *Tyrrel's* History of *England*, are these Words, which I am now writing out of it: *There being not above two Kings in all this long Series of more than two hundred and sixty Years, concerning whom I have not brought express Testimonies from Authors of undoubted Credit, both in Print and Manuscript, of their* Election *by the States of the Kingdom*. The Doctor quotes this very Introduction himself, *p.* 56, and yet asserts very confidently, there are no such Words in it, *p.* 6. What can one make of such a Man as this!

Page 9. He mentions two most reverend and worthy Prelates of our Church, and one especially, my Lord's Grace of *Canterbury*, who has confirm'd what I have said of the Being of Parliaments, in the Quotation Dr. *Grey* brings against it: *That King* Alfred *appointed* Parliaments, says his Grace, *to meet twice a Year, is I confess in the*

Mirror of Justice; and that's all I pretended to in that Place. The *Mirror* of *Justice* was written not long after *Brady*'s pretended first Parliament, and the Author must needs know whether there were such Assemblies in the *Saxon* Times much better than those Writers who have since controverted it. Sir *Henry Spelman*, speaking of the same King *Alfred*, seems to give a Reason for the Discontinuance of those Conventions for some Time, on Account of the Ravages of the *Danes*.

From whence does this appear? cries Dr. *Zachary Gray*, p. 10. *not from any other Authority than his own bare Assertion*; tho' I quoted the *Mirror of Justice*, as mentioning Parliaments twice a Year in King *Alfred*'s Reign, and tho' my Lord of *Canterbury* confesses it is so in that Book, which is in good Reputation among the best Lawyers; yet Dr. *Zachary* boldly affirms, it was never said by any one but my self. As notoriously false as this is, He proceeds in the Abundance of his Modesty. *How far he is to be credited I leave to the Reader to judge.*

What my Lord of *Canterbury*, in the beforementioned Citation, seems to intend, is, of what Persons the *Saxon Parliaments* consisted. I know very well they have different Apellations, and did not always consist of the same Degrees. Sometimes the Superior Clergy and the Barons, and not always the same Barons: Sometimes the Superior and Inferior Clergy, the *Barons*, *Eldermen*, and *Wisemen*: Sometimes the Prime Bishops and Prime Men, *Episcopi & Optimates*: Sometimes the *Communitas*, the *Populus*, when all were represented. The Doctor, from Page 11, to Page 50, takes a great deal of Pains to prove that the *Great Councils* were not called *Parliaments*, nor were always compofed of the same Orders; for which I never contended, but that all Orders were repre-

sented

ſented at one Time or another, and ſometimes altogether, as explained in this Monkiſh Verſe, tranſlated by my *Dear Self*, to uſe his own Dear Words, tho' he vouches for me, that I do not underſtand a Word of *Latin*.

Prælati, Proceres, miſſique Potentibus Urbes:
i. e.
The Prelates, Peers, the Cities by their Powers.

And when he turns an old Monkiſh *Latin* Verſe into ſo good an *Engliſh* one, I'll own he is not the Man I took him for, but *erit mihi magnus*, &c.

Page 16. Sir *Henry Spelman*, *'tis granted was a very learned, and a very valuable Man*, ſo he was, but not always right as to the *Saxon* Conſtitution of *Parliaments*. I quoted his *Gloſſary* only as to the Word *Parliament*, and not as to the Thing. *Spelman's*, "Wittenagemot *idem apud Anglo Saxones* "*fuit quod apud nos hodie Parliamentum eſt*." "The "*Wittenagemot* was the very ſame Thing among "the *Saxons*, as the Parliament is now a Days "with us;" and every one knows what King, Biſhops, Lords, and Commons in Seſſion make. Let who will reconcile his other Citations out of *Spelman* to his *Gloſſary*, as quoted above; I ſhall content my ſelf with the Light he has given us, and what Dr. *Hody* takes from him, *That the* Council *of* Kingesbury *is to be eſteemed not an* Epiſcopal Synod, *but a* Parliament, *p.* 57, four hundred Years before *Brady* owns any ſuch Thing; and in another Place, they met not only *Conſultare ſed Statuere*.

The Reader will excuſe me if I add a little upon this Subject, it being no leſs important than the Foundation of our Conſtitution and Liberty. He will alſo obſerve with what a Forehead this Doctor of ours aſſerts, that the Law

for *Saxon* Parliaments, was a *bare Assertion* of my own. Not only that old Law Book, the *Mirror of Justice*, but a modern Author of a Treatise, called, *An Inquiry*, &c. printed in 1693, tells us, *'Tis most manifest, besides the positive Laws for Yearly* Parliaments, *that by the ancient Constitution of our Government, they did meet of Course at least* twice *every Year.* Another Writer, in a Treatise called, *The Claims of the People of* England, has these Words, *p.* 8. " 'Twas indeed an old Custom for " the Parliament to meet every Year on a Day cer- " tain, as on the first of *May*, and at a certain " Place; which Custom was interrupted by Rea- " son of Wars in the Land, which would not " suffer the King to meet his People at the usual " Time and Place." All which he says positively was my own *bare Assertion.*

I took Notice in the *Crit. Hist.* that I was not afraid of Authorities, when I had Truth on my Side; and tho' I pay as great Veneration to the Memory and Merit of Sir *H. Spelman*, as any one, yet I know if the Dispute had been between *Prerogative* and *Liberty*, how it would have fared with the latter by his Determination. Dr. *Grey* cites out of him: *He never found any Place for the* Commons *in these* great Councils, *in the* Saxon *Times*, p. 11. What then is meant by *Rex* Populum *Suum convocavit*, in the Laws of King *Ethelbert*? What by *Principum Procerum, Comitum & Omnium Sapientum Seniorum &* POPULORUM *totius Regni*, in King *Ina*'s Reign? When Dr. *Hody* attacks this ancient Author's Authority, 'tis with Reference to the Intermarriages of the *Saxons* and *Britains* then, and not to the *Popularum*, which he takes particular Notice of, *p.* 33. How must we understand the *Populo Terræ*, in the Council held by King *Oswald*, *Anno* 787? How the *Omnium Dignitatum Optimatibus Ecclesiasticarum Scil, & secularium Personarum*? All De-

grees

grees of the *Nobleſs*: I turn it thus; for that is a Term, which in the States of *France* took in others beſides the *Dukes*, *Counts*, *Earls* and *Barons*. This is ſaid of the Council of *Cloveſho*. What is meant by *Comitum Procerum totius Terræ Aliorumque Fidelium infinita Multitudine*; an infinite Multitude in the Aſſembly at *Wincheſter*, *Anno* 855? What by *POPULORUM & Senatorum Gentis Anglorum*, in King *Alfred*'s Council? What even by *Villani*, after the *Comites* in the Council of *London*, in King *Athelſtan*'s Reign, about the Year 930? What by *Tota Regni* INGENUITATE *& innumera* POPULI *Multitudine*, in King *Edgar*'s third Council, about the Year 970? How is *Univerſa Gente*, in the Confeſſor's Parliament, *Anno* 1053, to be underſtood? How *Rege Baronibus, & Populo*? and how *Communitas Angliæ*, in the ſame Reign, *Vide Hod.* p. 113, *&c.*? I have ſaid more on this Subject in the *Crit. Hiſt.* I can ſee plainly enough, that neither this our Doctor, nor his Aſſiſtants, are or would be acquainted with it: For the Truth is entirely on the Side of the Conſtitution which they endeavour to ſubvert. I could write Volumes upon it, were there Occaſion, which there is not; *Petit* and *Tyrrel* routed *Brady* long ago; and this Doctor is one of the pooreſt Dablers that has come after Him. He makes a great Stir about the *Sapientes Aldermanni*, and the like *Wiſemen* and *Eldermen*, in the *Saxon* Parliaments. Let the Terms be underſtood how you will; call thoſe Aſſemblies, *Wittenagemots*, *Mychelgemots*, *Councils*, *Colloquies*, what you pleaſe, I think enough is ſaid to prove, that the *Commons* aſſiſted at thoſe *Aſſemblies*, and that there were ſuch Aſſemblies in the *Saxon* Times, many hundred Years before *Brady* allowed it.

Did I not say, *Crit. Hist.* p. 34. *No Matter whether the States of the Realm were term'd a* Council *or a* Parliament; *those* Conventions *in* Poland *are a* Dyet, *in* Spain *a* Cortes, *in* Holland *an* Assembly, *in* England *a* Parliament. The Doctor has so much Stupidity, or something worse, in the Make of him, that he cou'd not discern between Words and Things: But the very Word *Parliament* was us'd before *Brady* says there was such a Thing in Being. *Annals* of *Burton*, A. D. 1258. *An Loquantur in* PARLIMENTIS *missi Sanctæ & Honestæ*, which shews there had been several Parliaments at that Time and before, and that the Term was well known. Under the Word *Wittenagemot* in Sir *Henry Spelman's Glossary*, he tells us, it is our Parliament. In the Description of those *Saxon* Assemblies quoted by Dr. *Grey*, he looks otherwise; but what says Dr. *Hody*, p. 123. *I pass'd by the Description of* Wittenagemot, *which Sir* Henry Spelman *and Mr.* Cambden *have given us, their* Judgments *being no Arguments in this Matter.* I affected to mention their Names, because I shall have Occasion in my second Volume to speak of the Latter's Tenderness to Popery and Monkery; and where that Disposition goes, there will not want Reflections upon our Protestant Constitution, Spiritual and Temporal. These are great Names, and worthy Respect; but the Publick Good is much more respectable.

My Words, *p.* 30. are the same he quotes; Canute *was made* King, *ab omni Anglorum* Populo. Against this he brings the worthy Dr. *Hody*, *p.* 23. King *Ethelred* being dead, the Bishops, Abbots, and *Proceres Terræ*, rejected his Family, and proclaim'd *Canute* for their King. Prithee, Reader, mark what a clear-headed Doctor this is? He quotes afterwards on the same Occasion, in *Re-*

gem

gum elegere, *Canutum elegere*, the *Election* of King *Canute* out of other ancient Authors mention'd by the *Greek* Professor, as to the *Election*, that is the *Revolutional Right*, in Cases of extreme Necessity, such as that was; and what more have I pretended? What can be stronger than Dr. *Hody*'s laying out of *Higden*, the Convention *elected* the Hereditary Family, and proclaimed *Canute*? If he had any Meaning in him, his *frivolous* Cavil here, is on the Score of *Omni Populo Anglorum*; and he's with great Gravity and Sagacity endeavouring to prove, that all the People of *England*, Men, Women and Children, did not meet on *Salisbury Plain* to chuse King *Canute*. There is no need of turning to *Glossaries* to know what is every where to be understood by *Populus Angliæ*, their Representative. The *Populi Romani* were not all the Tribes assembled in the Field of *Mars*, but the Senate and the Ruling Powers. If I had said at *Rome*, 37 Years ago, the People of *England* have made the Prince of *Orange* King, would not every Body have understood it to be the *Convention*? What a Drudgery is it to have any thing to do with such a Mortal!

As to his deep Learning about Lord *Coke*'s Parliament, *p.* 23. let him have the Glory to repeat what others have said of it as a *Fiction*, but I will also repeat what I said my self before him; *allowing the* Fiction *against the Authority of my Lord* Coke: It shews that the Constitution, and the very Word *Parliament*, were known a hundred Years before *Brady* will have it that the latter had a Name or Being. The Author of that Fable liv'd, says *Hody*, 130 Years after the Year 1020, when *Canute*'s Parliament, as describ'd by Lord *Coke*, is suppos'd to sit: Consequently the Term was then known, and with the Term the Thing, *Anno* 1150, or thereabouts, which is 115 Years before *Brady*'s first Parliament. This was all the Use I made of

it, and enough for the *L. L. D.* and the *M. D.* his beſt Authority.

Page 25, *Proceed we to conſider what he offers after the Conqueſt.* I knew what he was, and of what he was capable, by his *Proceed we*, and other Expreſſions, which, as I ſaid, and he after me, *ſmell of the Cask.* He begins his *Norman* Hiſtory with acknowledging that I am a *ſly* Fellow; I can't ſay ſo by him; but I ſhall prove very often that he is a *ſad* Fellow, which is all one in the *Initial*. My *Sliveſs* conſiſts in leaving out the Word *Proceribus*: How did I know what was meant by it according to his Account of the *Latin* I have! How cou'd I know whether there was any Harm in putting of it in, or leaving of it out! However, I will in this Place acknowledge I did underſtand what was the *Engliſh* of *Proceres*, and that it was Couſin-German to *Optimates*, and never pretended that the *Saxon* Parliaments were in all Seſſions compoſed of Members of the ſame Degrees; but that at Times, and according to the Urgency of Affairs, and the Proofs I have given of it, all Degrees did ſit. What I intended here, was the *Elegere* mentioned by himſelf, the *Conſent of the* Engliſh, mention'd by *William of Poictou*; the *Preſence of all the People of* England, mention'd by *Vitalis*; the *Election*, mention'd by *Gemeticenſis*; the *cum Favore Procerum ac Nobilium*, in the Regiſter of *Battle Abbey*; and the Oath *Coram clero ac Populo*, out of *Florence* of *Worceſter*. It appears now that I left out *Populo* as well as *Proceribus*; and ſo I might; for I did not intend to tell by whom he was *elected*, but that there was a *Convention* and an *Election*.

In the next Page, he charges me with falſifying the learned *Greek* Profeſſor, whom I quoted, for ſaying, *Conventio quorum videtur eſſe Parliamentum*; he adds, Hody *ſays no ſuch Thing*. My Words the direct

direct contrary. *Hody* ſpeaks of a *Parliament*, *Anno* 1077, and of a *Charter*, in which were theſe Words, *Conventio*, &c. Here's a good Man for you; and here he is again. *Hody* has theſe very Words, ſpeaking of that Charter, *I agree with the Writer, that it was a* Parliament, *p.* 157. Is he to be match'd, d'ye think, for a fine Head and an honeſt Heart? I deſir'd no more of the Doctor; I did not care whether the Charter was of no better Authority than King *Lucius*'s to the *Arch-Flamens* and *Flamens*, made by him *Archbiſhops* and *Biſhops*, about certain Lands in *Hampſhire*. Dr. *Hody* foreſaw that the Charter would fall into ſome fooliſh Hand or other, who wou'd abuſe the Quotation, and therefore he added, *I agree*, &c. That *Parliament* was a hundred Years before *Brady*'s *Æra*.

The next Quotation he takes from me, is concerning *William Rufus*'s Succeſſion, when his elder Brother *Robert* Duke of *Normandy* was alive. Dr. *Zachary* affirms with the laſt Aſſurance, "*William* "*Rufus* came in by a different Claim than that of "*Election*, p. 27. as by *Conqueſt*, p. 28." *Gerveſe* of *Tilbury*, and after him Dr. *Hody*, aſſures us, on the contrary, he was ELECTED King, *p.* 174. The Reader will find he is no Changling in this Point: He ſtands Buff by the *Hereditary Right*, as long as there is a Reign which makes againſt it; if I fall in my Stile, 'tis to ſuit it to his Company.

I ſay, in the Reign of *Henry* I. he was made King *Univerſo Populo*; ſo ſays he; but being an excellent Linguiſt, he tranſlates *all the People*, the *Clergy* and *Nobility* only. I doubt he is not over literal in it, becauſe *Knighton* tells us, the *Convention* who choſe him, conſiſted of the *Whole Community of the Kingdom*; *Diſtinguiſhing*, ſays *Hody*, *the Community there preſent from the Barons*, p. 184. As long as he came not in by the lineal unalienable Deſcent, as eſtabliſhed by the *Oxford* Decree,

'tis

'tis all one to me who elected him; but that he was choſen King, appears as well by his Brother *Robert*'s being alive ſtill, as by what we read in Hiſtory.

We are not yet come to a *Jure Divino* Reign; however, he will enter his Proteſt againſt any other Reign, and go on gainſaying. *Gervaſe* of *Tilbury* writes, that King *Stephen* was crown'd *Convocatis Epiſcopis & Proceribus*, & Wikes *annuentibus Præſulibus & Proceribus Regni*, which this *Rarity* tranſlates thus, *It is evident he was ſet up and crown'd by a Faction*; the Term which all good Subjects have gone by ever ſince the *Revolution*. This Faction conſiſted of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal; not only they, but the King himſelf has the Lye given him by our Doctor, *p.* 32. He was choſen by a *Faction*, tho' he ſays *it was by the Clergy and Laity*. He then tells us what we muſt underſtand by the *Clergy* and *Laity*, the *Nobility*; becauſe there was then no *Knights* of the Shire, nor *Freeholders*. After this he goes back to King *Henry* I.'s Reign, and falls upon me for ſaying, "In a Manuſcript in the *Cotton* Library, it is ſaid, "(*A. D.* 1116.) the King call'd a Council of all "the States of the Realm, both of the *Prelates*, "*Nobility*, and *Commons*:" But he ſays, *He's unwilling to take my Word.* I am ſure I will neither take his Word, nor his Bond; and I'm ſatisfy'd no Body will be bound for him. Dr. *Hody* directs to the MS. *Cott. Lib. Titus A.* 13. and upon this Occaſion the learned Profeſſor has this Paſſage. "Sir *Henry Spelman* is as much miſtaken on "the other Side; for he denies that the *Commonalty* were there preſent, or that any of the known "Hiſtorians, either of that Age or any other, ſay "they were; but to confute that Aſſertion, let us "hear *William* of *Malmsbury*, who liv'd even at "that Time; *Ei vix dum* 12 *Annorum eſſet*, Om-

"nes

" nes LIBERI HOMINES, *Angliæ & Normanniæ*
" CUJUSCUNQUE ORDINIS ET DIGNITA-
" TIS, CUJUSCUNQUE DOMINI FIDELES
" *manibus, & ſacramenta ſe dedere coacti ſunt.*"
The Commons were no ways concern'd in this Meeting. To this let old *Brompton* reply: *Poſt hæc* PARLIAMENTUM *ſuum apud* Sarisberiam *convocavit.* There's the Word *Parliament* again 150 Years before *Brady* owns there was any ſuch Aſſembly. *Walter* of *Hemingford* has the ſame Account: *Rex tenuit* PARLIAMENTUM *ſuum apud Satisberiam.* Dr. *Hody* upon this, *p.* 198. *Some mention an ancient MS.* (Ap. Spelman, L. c.) *in which it is expreſsly ſaid, That the* COMMONS *were then ſummon'd.* What follows, is to ſhew the cautious Reader to be upon his Guard: Let the Enemies to our Conſtitution bring what Names they will to vouch for them, *p.* 199. the learned Profeſſor adds; " Here Sir *Henry Spelman*
" is again miſtaken, when he thinks there was
" no *conſulting* in the Convention, who only did
" Homage to the Prince; for the Hiſtorians of
" the ſame Age aſſure us, that the Cauſe between
" *Ralph* Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, and *Thurſtan*
" Archbiſhop of *York*, was there debated; *Ead-*
" *mer*, *Florence*, *Brompton*, and *Hemingford*, con-
" firm this; and *Hoveden* mentions that Cauſe
" only without the Swearing.

Page 33. He has an Interrogatory for me. I ſaid *Henry* II. was *a Principibus vocatus & a Populo deſiderat us. What doth all this amount to? Not to a Proof of the King's being choſe by the People!* He's ſurpriſingly dull. Yes, it does amount to ſuch a Proof, *Vocatus* here can have no other Signification: His Mother the Empreſs *Maud* being alive, in whom was the Hereditary Right; tho' the *Doctor*, *p.* 34. ſays boldly and falſly, it was in himſelf, which it cou'd not be, till after his Mother's Death.

Death. Dr. *Grey* tells us *Vocatus* ſhould be *invited*, and I tell him it ſhou'd be *call'd*, and that *call'd*, *invited*, and *elected*, are all one in this Caſe. The Prince of *Orange* was *invited* over by ſeveral Biſhops and others; for which they would have been Rebels, if he had not been made King.

Page 34. he rebukes me for ſaying after *Gervaſe*, that there were *Inferioris Ordinis Perſonæ* in the Parliament at *Northampton*. In another Place, *Gervaſe* ſays, there were *Innumera Multitudo Plebis* at his Coronation *Council*; and that they were not all unconcerned Spectators. One may learn by what the *Greek* Profeſſor informs us, *p.* 216. that PLEBS *is ſometimes uſed for* POPULUS *in general, and even for the* Commons *of* England *ſitting in* Parliament; which ſeems to be the moſt likely Interpretation, for that we have already given ſo many Proofs of their having a Seat there.

In the following Page he falls upon me with his uſual Ribaldry and Inſolence, and as if he had been *Some Body*, pretends to chaſtiſe me for animadverting upon his wonderful Hiſtorian Dr. *Brady*. I will not anſwer him; I do not think either his *Doctor's Reputation*, as he calls it, or his Own deſerve it; but I will confirm what I ſaid of the *Parliament* of *Clarendon*, that by *Proceres Regni* "muſt be underſtood the Chief of the *Commonalty*, "ſince the *Earls* and *Barons* at that Time were the "*Nobility*, and are particularly mention'd." As poor as he is in Intellect, he was cunning enough not to encounter ſuch plain Senſe as this. *Hoveden* tells us, the *Clergy* and *Laity* were gather'd together there. *Matthew Paris* mentions the *Clergy*, *Counts*, *Barons*, and *Proceres Regni*; which Dr. *Hody*, *p.* 221. tranſlates *the Chief of the* Commonalty. Another ancient Writer informs us, the King called together *Regnum Univerſum*. Let the beſt Criticks they have cull the Commonalty out of them

if

if they can. But, as I have often obſerv'd, the Practice of *Saxon* Times is ſufficient Proof that the *Commons* are every where to be underſtood when there's the leaſt Colour for it; and whoever has a Mind to ſee more of the *Parliament* of *Clarendon*, may have full Satisfaction as to the *Commonalty* in Dr. *Hody*, *Cou. & Conv. p.* 220. *& ſeq.* I ſhou'd take Notice of his awkward Raillery, in his *Profound* Author, *Learned* Author, *Conſiderable* Author, and ſuch like Stuff; but the Truth is, I am aſham'd to have any thing at all to ſay of him, and would ſhake him off as faſt as I cou'd, as a Scurrilous, Impertinent, *I don't know what*, nor ever deſire to know: He is ſo ſilly, that I wou'd pity him, were it not for his Forehead.

I ſay, the Archbiſhops, *&c. cum* Clero *&* Populo, ſat at Table at King *Richard*'s *Coronation Feaſt*. *What doth this prove?* quoth he again! He knows not, I verily believe. Why, it only proves that the *People* were a Part of the Company, what the Reader will ſee, tho' he can't; and I wiſh I cou'd tell the One ſomething more, which I wou'd leave the Other in Ignorance of; and that is, this ſame Company was a *Convention* or *Parliament*. I doubt not he will ſtare like a Man frighted. But let us turn to my old Friend Dr. *Hody*, and he will find, *p.* 216. theſe Words, *The Coronation Conventions were in thoſe Days the ſame with the Great Councils*; and what they were, has been already explain'd.

I ſlip over his Defence of the Religion and Morals of the Fryars and Nuns of thoſe Days, *p.* 41. for I believe there's hardly a Creature that can ſay its Catechiſm but knows enough of that Matter.

Page 44. Dr. *Grey*, who, like your Scolds, ſeems to inſiſt upon having the laſt Word, ſays again, *It is evident how far our Author is miſtaken in his*

Opinion

Opinion of the Right of the Commons to ſit in Parliament. This is one of the Sayings that execute themſelves. God be thank'd, the *Commons* of *England* in *Parliament* aſſembled know their Right, its Antiquity and Extent, much better than all the Doctors and Criticks in the Two famous Univerſities, or the Cities of *Lond.* and *Weſtm.* can tell them; and it was not for ſuch Readers that I wrote. What Sort of People it muſt be for whom Dr. *Zachary* writes, the Lord knows; one cannot without conjuring conceive it. My Intention was to put ordinary Readers, Perſons whoſe Capacity and Reading were but a little above Dr. *Grey*'s Size, into a Way, that when they read, they might not be miſled by ſuch Authors as *Brady*, *Heylin*, *Hicks*, *Collier*, *Nalſon*, *Wharton*, *A. Wood*, *Dugdale*, *Heath*, and *L'Eſtrange*, &c. not to mention here any more of 'em, nor yet to forget the *Grand Rebellion*, and the Archdeacon's *Hiſtory*.

Page 45. Another Interrogatory is ſtarted; to which I am to give in my Anſwer, and it ſhall be upon Oath, if that would do. I doubt not our Doctor would ſwear to his whole Book. In *Crit. Hiſt.* Page 37. I ſaid the King of *Scotland* did Homage to King *John*, at the *Famous Parliament of* Lincoln, in *Conſpectu Omnis Populi*: Upon which he demands, *What if King* John *and the King of* Scotland *met upon Top of a Hill?* Why then they met upon Top of a Hill: I was not about proving in what Street, Church, or Houſe of *Lincoln* they aſſembled; but I ſaid the People were with the *Parliament*, as they had been ſeveral Times before, and have prov'd what they did there. The *Populi* above is taken out of *Brompton*, and means the Rabble no more than *Parliament*, which the ſame Author *Brompton* makes uſe of on this very Occaſion; PARLIAMENTUM *ſuum uſq;* Lincolniam *convocaverat*; and *Hody* ſhews us what

an

an Hiſtorian his Dr. *Brady* is, by a Paſſage on the ſame Subject, which he ſlurs over, *Crit. Hiſt.* p. 38. He does the ſame by all that had been ſaid there about the Rights of the Commons, to the Year 1248; when he aſſures us, Dr. *Brady* owned there was a Parliament, and tells us what he ſays, in which there is not a Word of it: But he refers to a *Marginal Note*, where it is expreſsly ſaid. And Mr. *Echard* Himſelf affirms, that Dr. *Brady* was of Opinion there was no Parliament before the Year 1265; to which Knights, Citizens and Burgeſſes were admitted. What were the *Milites & Libere tenentes*, in the Parliament of *Wincheſter*, *Anno* 1215, Fifty Years before? What the *Urbes miſſis Potentibus*, three or four hundred Years before *Brady*'s 1265. *Anno* 1216. There was a Writ to chooſe four *Diſcreet Knights* for the Shires: And before that, *Anno* 1205, The learned *Greek* Profeſſor tells us, *It is certain the* Commons *of* England *voted in this* Parliament, *p.* 268. I have ſaid ſo much Here, becauſe, contrary to Cuſtom, he is ſo mild as to ſay only, *'Tis a Miſtake*; not *Lye*, nor *Cavil*, nor *unjuſt*, nor *falſe*, as he is uſed to do, and which I ſuppoſe is more natural to Him. Miſtakes I am ready to acknowledge and correct. He ſays *Brady* owns a Parliament before 1265. If he had owned one five hundred Years before, he had been righter ſtill; but the Archdeacon carries him on to the 49th of *Henry* the IIId, the *Critical and Rebellious Year*, to uſe Mr. *Echard*'s Words, *p.* 124. to which our preſent Conſtitution owes its Foundation. I told you he could not act the Gentleman much longer, that his foul Mouth would open again, and we ſhould be obliged to hold our Noſes. "I doubt not, *quo this* "*Fine* Doctor *of ours*, the Reader has conceived "a juſt Idea of his *Honeſty* and *Judgment*; for ne-"ver did Mortal before *falſify*, *miſtake*, or *miſap-*

"*ply*

"ply Facts ſo much as He has." What is to be done with ſuch a Man as this? Is He not a Perſon of Senſe and Integrity, after what we have ſeen of him in the preceding Pages? and we have much more ſtill to ſee of Him. All His *Billingſgate* was for my ſaying only, *p.* 47. That the *Parliament* of *Weſtminſter* conſiſted of *Magnates omnes, & Communitas Populi.* 'Tis for This that ſuch a Flux of Ribaldry has drivel'd from Him. He inſinuates, that I make *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter* ſay ſo, when I only add, *Matthew* of *Weſtminſter* ſtiles it *Parliamentum Magnum*; which he Himſelf acknowledges. I did not ſay he ſaid of whom it conſiſted, but that the Word *Parliament* was then uſed by *M. Weſt.* I did not repreſent it ſo, nor is it ſo in his Quotation from the *Crit. Hiſt. Five Years after a* Parliament *was holden at* Weſtminſter, *in a moſt ſolemn Manner, conſiſting of* Omnes Magnates & Communitas Populi. *Matt. Weſtminſter ſtiles it* Parliamentum Magnum; *And yet we have ſeveral Years to come before* Brady, &c. Have I fathered the leaſt Thing here upon *Matt. Weſt.* but the *Parliamentum Magnum.* The *Magnates & Communitas* may be ſeen in Mr. *Petit*, of the *Rights of the Commons*, ſpeaking of a Subſidy *per Magnates & Communitatem Regni*, 32 Hen. III. *p.* 34, 35. I am ſure of nothing ſo much as that the Reader would excuſe me, if I flung his *Libel* after *Trapp*'s *Virgil*, into the Place where Dr. *Swift* ſaw it in one of his *Meditations.* But, for the Satisfaction of Friends, I'll for this once go through with him, having taken a Reſolution never to be bit again, nor have to do with him or his Fellows. If I am a little angry, the Lye that he has here given me, is ſufficient Provocation; and I expect more ſuch Treatment from his good Senſe and good Manners. How might I have us'd him, had he been worth it, for ſaying

ing *Brady* never *diſguis'd or colour'd Facts*, p. 36. that his Vouchers are the beſt imaginable; of whom Dr. *Hody* ſays, *Conv.* p. 372. One or two Things I ſhall add to confute Dr. *Brady*; and again, *His Aſſertion appears to be falſe*, &c. I refer to the Author for the reſt: It proves there were *Burgeſſes* in *Parliament*, when *Brady* very boldly aſſerts there were not; which Falſity he was charg'd with in the *Crit. Hiſt.*

Page 30. He makes me guilty of a Miſtake, for ſaying the firſt Statute of *Mortmain* paſs'd in *Edward* I.'s Reign. Mr. *Fox* in his *Acts* and *Monuments*, from whom I took much relating to the Clergy, himſelf being a Divine, and a very religious One, ſays, *p.* 443. *Vol.* I. in the Reign of King *Edward* I. *Within two Years after the Statute of* Mortmain *was* firſt *enacted*; *which is as much as to ſay, that no Man ſhou'd give unto the* Church *any Lands or Rents, without a ſpecial Licence from the King.*

His next Quotation is about my calling the Biſhop of *Cheſter William Langton*, whom Mr. *Echard*, ſays Dr. *Zachary*, calls *Walter Langton*; Biſhop *Godwin* ſtiles him *Walter de Langton*: So that we all differ in a Matter of this Importance. He adds, He was not Biſhop of *Cheſter*, but Biſhop of *Coventry* and *Litchfield*. This is an amazing Inſtance of his profound Learning! The Biſhop of *Coventry* and *Litchfield* was then Biſhop of *Cheſter*, and ſo continued till the *Reformation*, if we may in any Thing give Credit to *Peter Heylin*'s *Help to Hiſt.* p. 192. "*Cheſter* was anciently in the Dio-
" ceſe of *Litchfield*, one of the Biſhops of which
" Church removing his See to *Cheſter*, *A.D.* 1075.
" as the more remarkable and noted Place, oc-
" caſioned that his Succeſſors were many Times
" called *Biſhops* of *Cheſter*.

As to what he says against *Hollingshead*, let him run away with it if he will; neither he nor his Cronies know why *Hollingshead* is valuable: It is not for his Stile, tho' better than his own; nor for his Method, as regular as some late Historians. What it is for, let 'em find out, when their Eyes and their Understandings are better.

Proceed we; the Brogue again! you may see how we came by him: Our Author has borrow'd his Account of King *Lucius* from Sir *Henry Spelman*, which is at once directly false. I took every Word of it from *Sammes Britannia*, *Lucius* being a *British* King. *Sammes* has a Folio Page (263.) on the Subject, and I matter not from whom he took it; only I must observe, 'tis more than probable that Sir *Henry Spelman* himself took a good Part of it from *John Fox*, *Vol.* I. *p.* 138. that very *Fox* whom Doctor *Zachary* speaks of so contemptibly, and doubtless for no other Reason than his being a *Puritan*. If there are some Errors in so voluminous a Work as his Book of *Martyrs*, Judgment and Humanity, in which our Doctor is shamefully deficient, would have consider'd, that where he must have so many Facts from *Report*, it was impossible to avoid some Slips; yet his *Martyrology* is treated by *A. Wood*, *Collier*, *Grey*, and others of their Kidney, as no better than the Fables of *Æsop*.

Nothing was ever falser than what Dr. *Zachary* adds, that I took the Exceptions to the Pope's Letter *Word for Word from Sir* Henry Spelman, *without the Ingenuity to own it, or name my Author at all*, p. 52. Every Word and Syllable, as to Substance, I took from Mr. *Sammes*, Bishop *Godwin*, and Mr. *Fox*, and did not think there was any Need of naming Authors, when such a Forgery as that was only in Question.

The Law-Doctor gives up the Story of King *Lucius*'s making *Archbishops* and *Bishops*, p. 54. I did not imagine he cou'd be so condescending, the Tale being incredible, and therefore the more of a Piece with his others.

I own my Abhorrence of the Lives of the Monks, and my Contempt of their Learning, some few excepted; and nothing else cou'd have induc'd me to name Dr. *Tanner* with *Dugdale*, whose Zeal for Monkery is as remarkable as his indefatigable Labour. I am sorry what I said of Dr. *Tanner* has expos'd him to the Panegyricks of so worthless a Flatterer as our L. L. D. appears to be. I respect that Gentleman for his Learning and Merit. But so it will fall out: Men will often suffer for their Company. In the Preface to *Notitia Monastica* is a long Quotation out of *Dugdale*'s *Warwickshire*, which represents the Commissioners employ'd to visit the Monasteries as a Parcel of false crafty Fellows, who contriv'd a *Narrative* without Ground or Reason, setting forth the Wickedness and Lewdness of the Fryars and Nuns. How they practis'd with their *Craft*, is there intimated; and the Author of the *Notitia* seems to give into it more than one cou'd expect from so worthy a Man, and so good a Protestant. I shou'd take the Liberty to remark on what is his own, had I more Leisure, to excuse my mentioning him with *Dugdale*; for certain it is, that long before the *Reformation* the Manners of the Monasticks were animadverted on by others as well as *Chaucer*.

Dugdale was without doubt well vers'd in the Monkish Antiquities and Heraldry: His Works have all the Value in them which Works of that Kind can pretend to. But I question whether any good Protestant, or good *Englishman*, was ever

confirm'd in his Religion or Principles by reading him.

Dr. *Zachary*, as if he really knew what was Senſe and what Nonſenſe, ſays, *p.* 54. I am *inconſiſtent*, in making an *Apoſtolical Succeſſion* from *Damianus* and *Fugatius*, and afterwards from *Auſtin* the Monk. Both of theſe Succeſſions were made for me by ſeveral Pretenders to them; and the Inconſiſtency in it muſt lie at the Door of the Makers. He then adds, the two Perſons were nam'd *Faganus* and *Diruvianus*. He's ſo ignorant, that it is Charity to ſet him right, if it was not for another Quality he has which renders him unworthy of it. Theſe two Miſſionaries went by ten ſeveral Names, and yet it is very probable they had neither Name nor Being. *Damianus* is call'd *Dervianus*, *Diminianus*, *Divianus*, *Donatianus*. Will he have any more? *Fugatius* is call'd *Faganus*, &c. Now becauſe I did not hit that Name which he liked beſt, for he had the ſame Reaſon to find Fault with the one as with the other, he cries out, *If our Author's Readers expect Exactneſs from him, either in Hiſtory or Chronology, they will find themſelves much miſtaken.* The Exactneſs in *Hiſtory* about *Damianus*, we have ſeen; and the Exactneſs in Chronology comes next.

Page 62. I have put the Year 740 for 742, as he will have it. I'll not give my ſelf the Trouble to ſee whether 'tis ſo, or not ſo; ſuch Chronological Errors being ſo common, that there are few Facts which are not variouſly dated. In this very Year 742 Sir *Henry Spelman* places the Council of *Cloveſho*, which others place *Anno* 744, and Dr. *Hody* 747; Sir *Henry* in his *Councils* places *Ina*'s Laws *Anno* 692, and in his *Gloſſary* he ſays he began to reign *A. D.* 712. It would be a much eaſier Task to write a Book as big as Mr. *Echard*'s,

of

of the Differences in Chronology, than to *expunge* what ought to be expung'd in his Hiſtory. This very Author, if he's worthy of the Name, has himſelf tranſgreſs'd in the ſame Kind. He tells the World I have made a Chaſm of 100 Years in Church Hiſtory: From Pope *Cletus*, who was martyr'd *A. D.* 92. to Pope *Soter*, who was Biſhop of *Rome*, *Anno* 168. according to Mr. *Echard*'s Chronology is but 76 Years. He cou'd not ſee that I ſaid 100 Years indefinitely, and to lay a Snare in the Way for him to commit this great Chronological Error.

The next falſe Aſſertion for which he deſerves good Diſcipline, is in the next Page 55. The Fault is the more enormous, it being in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and againſt his belov'd and eſteem'd Mr. *Echard*: 'Tis alſo brought in ſo fooliſhly, 'twould grieve one to ſee it, if one had the leaſt Kindneſs for him. Speaking of the before-mention'd Chaſm in the Succeſſion of the Popes, of whom I purpoſely left out *Eight*, he adds, *If the Author of the* Crit. Hiſt. *had known the Popes, he believes his Good Nature would have given him Leave to have nam'd them.* I can't help telling the Reader, that *Tallent*'s Tables, the beſt Chronology extant, lay open before me when I was linking that uninterrupted Chain, and there were all the Names of the Popes, in Chronological Order, from Pope *Paul* to Pope *Odeſcalchi*. If I had thought any Body car'd for it, I could have written that Hiſtory as eaſily as Dr. *Zachary* can write any thing, that is, I could have ſtollen it *Verbatim*, and ſhew'd my ſelf a much greater *Scholar* than he, who has pick'd up only a Dozen of 'em, and thoſe wrong too, in the very Beginning of the Catalogue. *Petrus Linus*, and it ſhould have been *Paulus Linus*: Nay, he is ſo bold in this Falſity, that he ſays it *ſhould be* Peter *not* Paul, twice in a Page

Directly contrary to which, Mr. *Echard*, *Eccles. Hist. Vol.* II. *p.* 388. *l.* 22. ſays, *Linus* ſucceeded *Paul*, *Cletus* ſucceeded *Linus*, and ſo on to the End of the Chapter. The Man is as grave all this while as if the Chaſm had not been affected, to render the whole Buſineſs more laughable. If I could have been ſerious on ſuch a Subject, I would have made Uſe of an Authority, againſt which neither *Heylin*, nor *Collier*, nor *Hicks*, nor *Wharton*, nor himſelf, nor one of 'em all, durſt ſay a Word, and that is *Stephen Gardiner* Biſhop of *Winchester*, who burnt ſo many *Puritans* in Q. *Mary*'s Days. 'Tis in his Treatiſe *De Vera Obedientia*: *Likewiſe as concerning the local Succeſſion of* Peter, *the Pope hath nothing thereby to claim. If he will be Succeſſor of* Peter, what follows I'm ſure will never go down with 'em: *He muſt ſucceed him in Doctrine and Conditions; and in ſo doing, he neither will, neither yet ſhall need to ſeek for Honour, but ſhall be honoured of all, according as a good Man ſhould be, and that much more than he, being a good Man, would require.* What Truth is this, even from the Lips of one that had lick'd the Blood of the Martyrs! How often have I declar'd the ſame Sentiments, as to the Succeſſion, that it is truly Apoſtolical in all Miniſters conſcientiouſly diſcharging their Function, and that ſuch never did, nor ever will want Reſpect; nor will ſuch as the Doctor and other ſuch *Diminutives* ever be able to extort it.

Dr. *Grey* has found out two *Witticiſms* in the *Crit. Hiſt.* which the Author cou'd not find out himſelf. If there had been any thing arch in the Genealogy, he has ſpoilt it by *aping* it, and without all doubt, his Faction are ready to knock him o'the Head, for forging ſo honourable a Deſcent for the Writer of that Hiſtory, to which he heartily ſubſcribes, and has a good Mind to make him

him prove it in the Courts of *Apollo* and the Earl *Marshal's*, or leave him indicted there for the Forgery. I cannot foul my Mouth as he does, or I shou'd reckon my self entitl'd to treat him *de haut en bas*; which, for Dr. *Zachary's* Sake, who understands no Tongue but what is taught by every Country Pædagogue, I translate *with Contempt*, or *as I please*. Folly is infectious, and if I offend, 'tis by his Example. How is it possible to keep within Bounds, when a Man has such Provocation? He gives me the LYE, *p.* 60. when he tells the most notorious One himself; and if not the dullest, he will appear the wickedest Creature that ever set up for an Author. *What follows is a* Lye *of our Historian's own making, if it be one*, quoth our *Doctor*. Directly contrary to which it appears at Sight to be a Lye, and I shall prove it is not of my own making: The Words are these, speaking of St. *Alban*: *His Head spoke after it was cut off; Angels ascended and descended singing to him all Night; and such as had been drowned in the River he dried up, were found alive.* This is what he affirms with the most harden'd Forehead. I added, to the Fable of St. *Alban's* Martyrdom, tho' they are the very Words of the Martyrologist, *Vol. I. p.* 115. "But among all other Evidences and De-
" clarations, sufficient to disprove the *Legendary*
" Story of St. *Alban*, nothing maketh more against
" it than the very Story it self, as where he bring-
" eth in the Head of the Holy *Martyr* to speak
" unto the People after it was smitten off from
" the Body; also where he bringeth in the An-
" gels going up and coming down in a Pillar of
" Fire, and singing all the Night long; *Item*, in
" the River which he saith St. *Alban* made dry;
" such as were drowned in the same before, in
" the Bottom he found alive." All which Dr. *Zachary* again, with the same staring Front, as-

ſures the Reader, *p.* 16. *Is wholly an Addition of my own.* If I could have uſed him as he deſerves, might not I have been juſtify'd in it by theſe two Falſe Aſſertions; but I am a Stranger to his Manners, which are truly of the Dreggs of the People, in which I doubt not he was dropp'd, and is never like to get out of it. He then goes on to defend the Legend of St. *Alban*'s Miracles, by ſuch an Authority as his own, *Jeremy Collier*, *Ado Viennenſis*, *Rabanus Maurus*, *Northerus*, and *Matthew Florilegus*.

I foreſaw that ſome *Zachary Grey* or other would fall upon me for railing at the Clergy. I frequently declared as much in the firſt Volume, and ſhall be obliged to explain my ſelf in this Treatiſe, and in the ſecond Volume alſo. I know very well one cannot too much reſpect the pious and orthodox Miniſters of our Church: But what's this to your *Grey*'s, your *Collier*'s, your *Cock*'s, your *Snatt*'s, your *Stacey*'s, your *Paul*'s, and a Roll of 'em too large for my little Book? What's this to your Furious, Ignorant, Immoral, Illiterate, Factious, and Inſolent Prieſthood, if there be any ſuch in Town or Country? Pray God the Number of 'em may leſſen, and that the Examples and Leſſons of their Superiors may have ſuch good Effect upon 'em, as to prevent all Reproach hereafter.

It cannot be but the *Doctor*'s Skull muſt be impenetrable, and no Intelligence could reach the Brains of him, *p.* 64. after repeating what the Archdeacon had ſaid of *Monkiſh* Legends, which he repeats again, he tranſpoſes a Reflection of mine made before, and then cries out, *What is this better than denying and aſſerting at one and the ſame Time, and with the ſame Breath.* The Reader will be ſurpriſed when he finds, that I only ſaid *One cannot depend upon them, yet we are forced to*

make

make Use of them. Were there any other Writers but the *Monks*, except of some small Parcels of History? One may say something of *Jeffery* of *Monmouth*'s Tale about *Brute*, if a History of *England* was to be written; yet for all that, is he to be depended upon? Match my *Doctor* if you can, for Stupidity and Assurance.

He blames me, *p.* 59. for introducing the Fable of *Ursules*, and her 11000 Virgins, with a *Sneer!* Who can write the History of Dr. *Zachary*'s Saints and Miracles without *sneering?* He adds, *he knows no Modern Historian who mentions it*: He know, that's very pretty indeed! Does he know any Antient or Modern Historian, but by *Indexes* and *Quotations?* He excepts *Polydore*, *Caxton*, and *Cressi*. *Stow* tells it too, which was not within his Knowledge. As if he had been my *Evil Genius* and haunted me, as perhaps he is himself haunted, he here invades my Privacies, and assures the World I never so much as saw *Caxton*: A downright direct Untruth; which he backs by another, *p.* 73. *'Tis apparent that* Fox never saw *Caxton, tho' he pretends to copy him.* That learned Antiquary had not seen a Book printed but 100 Years before, out of which he takes the Account of King *John*'s being poyson'd by the Priest, as will hereafter be mention'd. Page 333. Vol. I. the *Martyrologist* in the Text writes thus, *It is recorded and found in the Chronicle of* William Caxton, *call'd* Fructus Temporum, *and in the Seventh Book*, which *Zachary Grey* declares he never saw. Page *ib.* in the Margin, *ex. Caxton Lib.* 7. But for all that, quo the Doctor, *he never saw* Caxton. This invisible Book was one of the first printed in *England*: The Author, a Citizen of *London*, an honest Man, who wou'd have been heartily sorry, had he foreseen that his Works wou'd have tempted any Body to have told so many Untruths about them.

I have elsewhere mention'd how loath I was to name the reverend and learned Dr. *Tanner*, when I spoke of *Dugdale*'s great Concern for the Ruins of Abbeys. It is pretty extraordinary, that those barbarous *Gothick* Buildings shou'd have so many Admirers, when there was hardly a Stone placed in one of them as it shou'd be, and, when the Learning that was acquir'd there was attended with so little useful Knowledge. It is very plain, the *Religious* were bred up in a blind Obedience to the Pope, and that the Priesthood under him, had the absolute Disposal of the Wills and Wealth of the *Monasticks*; the Loss of which Power is what *Dugdale* and others lament, as if Church and State had lost their best Foundation. I have never considered Sir *William Dugdale* as an *Antiquary* or an *Herald*: He doubtless understood *Antiquity* and *Coats of Arms* as well as any Man, and his *Baronage* is a very valuable Book; but that has no Relation to his Partiality in his *View of the Troubles*, and his Zeal for Monkery in his *Monasticon*, and all his Writings about it.

Dr. *Grey*, having sufficiently prais'd *Dugdale*, turns his Encomiums to St. *Dunstan*, the same who pull'd the Devil by the Nose, as we read in some of Dr. *Zachary*'s best Authorities. He obtain'd a great Character for his *Sanctity and strict Manner of Living*; of which you may see enough in *Fox*. I don't wonder that proud imperious Monk has the good Word of our Doctor's Faction; he govern'd and insulted his Sovereign, and his Character agrees perfectly well with a Successor of his in the See of *Canterbury* about the Year 1640.

The next Quotation, *p.* 65. is of the same wicked Kind with that about St. *Alban*, a positive *Falsity*, in Defiance of Conscience or Modesty. I had said *William* of *Malmsbury* had reported that Miracles *were done at the Tomb of* Elfleda. He, on the con-

contrary, declares, *Malmsbury says no such Thing*; *the Author, I presume, borrow'd it from* John Fox. True, and from *John Fox* I will always borrow what relates to Priests, Monks, and Miracles. Having spoken of the *Lying Miracles* of *Dunstan*, as *Fox* phrases it, and the *Filthy Miracle* of *Editha*, in *Crit. Hist.* We read, *Vol.* I. *p.* 202. *And first here cometh in the Fabulous Miracles wrought at the Tomb of* Elfleda, *the King's Concubine, which* William Malmsbury *in these Words expresseth*:

Nam nonnullis, &c.
In ops visus & auditus si adorant tumulum,
Sanitati restituti probant Sanctæ meritam:

And much more: After which the *Martyrologist* adds, "The *English* of which Verses is needless "here to be recited; briefly the Effect is this, "*That both the Blind, Deaf, Halt, and such as be* "*Mad, receive their Health again if they worship the* "*the Tomb of this* Elfleda." Twice is the Name of King *Edgar*'s Harlot repeated; yet see how our Doctor stares you in the Face, and tells you another Falshood: The *Miracles were wrought at the Tomb of King* Edgar, *which probably* John Fox *or our Critick might mistake for the Tomb of* Elfleda. He has not his Peer upon Earth! *William* of *Malmsbury* says it was a She Saint, *Sanctæ*: Yet after all, out comes as much Wit as he had in the Gizzard of him, *the Names of* Edgar *and* Elfleda *beginning with the same Letter.*

If it could be, what follows is still worse. I said *Edward* a Bastard was crowned King by *Ethelred*'s Procurement: Upon which, he familiarly puts some more Interrogatories to me; as who *told him* Edward *was a* Bastard? and then he lugs out *Brady*, (*p.* 65, 66.) a special Authority as we shall see by and by. *Edward*, says that excellent

Hi-

Hiſtorian, *called the eldeſt Son of King* Edgar, *by his Wife* Egelfleda, *was placed in his Father's Throne according to his juſt Right.* This is the Man who never diſguiſed any Thing, and whom Dr. *Zachary* ſtands by and ſwears for, like any *Talis.*

What a Couple of *Doctors rare* we have, will be ſeen preſently: *William* of *Malmsbury* tells us, King *Edgar* debauch'd *Egelfleda*, or *Ælfleda*, Daughter of Duke *Ordmer*, and a *Nun* too, on whom he begot *Edward* in *Baſtardy*, for which he was injoin'd Penance by *Dunſtan*, and afterwards took him a lawful Wife, *Elfritha*, Mother of *Edmund* and *Ethelred.* *Simeon* of *Durham*, and *Hoveden* write, that *Alfer* Duke of *Mercia*, and many other Nobles, ſtood by *Ethelred*, the only right Heir and lawful Son of *Edgar.* *Honeſt John Fox* tells us plainly, why *Dunſtan* and the Regular Prieſts ſet aſide the Lineal Deſcent, and *elected, conſecrated*, and *anointed Edward* the *Baſtard*, King. Becauſe the Duke of *Mercia*, and the *Engliſh* Lords who were for *Ethelred*, the right Heir, *expell'd the Abbots and Monks who had* intruded *into Churches*; the pretended Zeal of the Faction in our Days for Hereditary Right is all Grimace. Touch a College or a Pulpit, and hear what they ſay then. We remember what they ſaid about *Magdalen* and Dr. *Sharp*, and what they did; and it was well ſaid and well done, had they had the Grace to have perſever'd. He's extremely nice in his Terms on ſome Occaſions, and as filthy and ſaucy in others. Now he chides me for being ſo bold as to take a Word out of Hiſtory, and call *Edward* Baſtard: Why, he is not the firſt King that was called ſo; what does he think of *William* the Conqueror, *&c.*? He adds, I can be *free with the Characters of Kings, if I don't like them.* He means, I have ſpoke the Truth of King *James* I. King *Charles* I. and King *Charles* II.

tho'

tho' not from my ſelf, but from others; for I could know but little of the Facts at Ten Years old. The Kings and Queens ever ſince, he inſinuates that I ſpeak well of, and ſo I do, and ſo I will, or I muſt be the moſt undutiful and ungrateful of Subjects; the Reigns ſince being as much a Glory to the *Engliſh* Annals, as thoſe before were a Diſgrace. I ſay no more about *Lanfranc*, p. 68. tho' Dr. *Grey* goes about to demonſtrate that *Contention* for *taking Place* is an *eminent Inſtance* of *Learning* and *Wiſdom*. I humbly conceived they were not, and if he has prov'd they are, he has done ſomething.

When he compares *Caxton* and *Fox*, about the the Murder of King *John*, he does it falſly again. *Vide Fox*, *Vol.* I. *p.* 333. "And firſt of all he, "*Simon* the Monk of *Swinſtead*, counſel'd with his "*Abbot*, ſhewing him the whole Matter, and "what he was minded to do. He alledged for "himſelf, the Propheſy of *Caiaphas*, ſaying, it is "better that one Man ſhould die, than all the "People ſhould periſh." Dr. *Grey* goes no farther in this Period than *minded to do*. Why does he leave out what follows, but to hide the Murderer's Prophanation of the Holy Scripture. There are more Alterations of the Text in this Quotation, but I have not Room nor Time to repeat them. I confeſs I left out too much of what *Fox* tells us concerning this Prieſt's Parricide, *p.* 332. You have the Abbot's formal Abſolution of him for murdering the King, the perpetual Maſs ſaid for his Soul, and other horrible Circumſtances.

Having lately read of a *German* Emperor that was poiſon'd with the *Hoſt* by another Prieſt, it ran ſo in my Head that the Word *Sacrament* eſcaped me, which ſhou'd not have been there; and becauſe he was not poiſon'd at the Sacrament, Dr.

Zachary

Zachary will have it, that he was not poison'd at all. *The Writers of those Times*, says he, with his Forehead spread, p. 75. *report no such Matters.* The *Martyrologies*, 150 Years before him, said, *most Writers agree in this, that he was poison'd by the Monk of Swinstead.* I hope the World after this Time will excuse me, if I shall answer him, and all such Answerers, with Contempt only.

I beg leave here to digress a little in a Line or two on the Character of Mr. *John Fox*, whom this insignificant Mortal treats as if he had been his Equal. I have more than once observ'd, that the Hatred to him is on Account of his *Piety* and *Charity*, and his Abhorrence of *Superstition* and *Persecution*. *A. Wood* tells us, *He resign'd his Fellowship at* Oxford, *about the Beginning of the* Reformation, *to prevent* Expulsion. And he calls that *Reformation* a *Mongrel Religion*, p. 231. The precious Dr. *Heylin*, says, *He appear'd in the* Schism *at* Frankfort *among the* English, *was against the* Church *of* England, *as settled in the Reign of* Edward VI. *and took* Part *with* Knox *and* Whittingham. What's the Reason these Doctors hate Mr. *Knox*, Dean *Whittingham*, Mr. *Fox*, *&c.* so much? Is it not for what we read of the Latter, *that he was always averse to subscribe to the* Canons, *and to the* Ceremonies *in some Part of the Church*? *Athen Oxon* doubts this, and that bold Jesuit *Parsons* charg'd him with *wilful Corruptions* and *Falsifications*. Dr. *Zachary* falling in with the Jesuit, censures him for want of Learning, *p. 65. I presumed he borrowed it at Second Hand*, insinuating, that *John Fox*, plain *John*, did not understand *Latin*. Again, take *Edward* the Confessor's Character from HONEST *John Fox*: To whom he says, the *Crit. Hist.* is *under more Obligations than perhaps he is willing to acknowledge*, as if he was asham'd of him. On the Contrary, he va-

lues

ſues himſelf on his Authority, as to Monks, Nuns, Miracles, Saints, and the like, notwithſtanding the idle Reflections and impudent Falſhoods, with which his Enemies, the *Papiſts*, and their Abettors, have endeavoured to blaken him. I have already taken Notice, that among ſo many thouſand of Facts, it was impoſſible for Mr. *Fox*, who was forced frequently to truſt to Hearſay, to avoid committing ſome Errors. I own'd too, in the firſt Volume, he might be ſomewhat too *credulous*. What's all this to his Hiſtory, taken from antient Authors, which being ſometimes next at Hand, I have made uſe of after him. Let us ſee what an Opinion learned and good Men have had of this labouring Author, and zealous Proteſtant Divine, and not mind what *Heylin* or *Grey* ſay; even in *A. Wood*, (*p.* 231, 232, 233.) we find, *He was eſteem'd at* Oxford, *eminent for his Learning and Knowledge of the three Tongues, was a Perſon of good natural Endowments, a ſagacious Searcher into Hiſtorical Antiquity, incomparably Charitable, of exemplary Life and Converſation.* There's another Reaſon why they are angry with him. *He ſhew'd much* Judgment in his *Labours*, and the like. *Delaune*, in his preſent State of *London*, ſpeaking of *Cripplegate* Church, where Mr. *Fox* has a Marble Monument, gives Part of his Epitaph, *He reviv'd the* Marian *Martyrs, was an indefatigable Searcher into Antiquity, and Defender of Goſpel Truth.* All this they muſt needs hate him for. But methinks, what follows, ſhou'd have been ſome Reſtraint upon them, ſince his Works, which they pretend to condemn, were honour'd above all Works ever yet printed in *England* or elſewhere by a private Man; being order'd by Dr. *Matthew Parker*, Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*'s Canons, *Anno* 1571. to be plac'd in the *common Halls* of *Archbiſhops*, *Biſhops*, *Deans*, *Arch-*

Archdeacons, Heads of Colleges, &c. I have been the longer upon Mr. *Fox*, to give an Idea of the Diſpoſition of theſe Men to fall back again to *Popery*, by their inveterate Malice to ſerious and ſerviceable Proteſtants.

Whenever we find ill Men well ſpoke of, we may aſſure our ſelves that good Men will have ill Treatment. The Marrow of Dr. *Zachary*'s lean Libel is of this Kind, and he can't help ſhewing us from whence he came, and what good Qualities he has, when probably he did not intend it. The Drab will be found out under a Lady's Gown, and the Brute under the Civilians. See if I have not Cauſe to deſcend to his own Stile. After he has been guilty of ſo much Falſhood, ſo much Inſolence, he ſays of me, *p.* 75. of whom he knows nothing, *He is ſo little verſed in his Authorities, as not to have ſeen ſo much as the Lettering or Title Pages of abundance of Books, which he (out of his great Modeſty) vouchſafes to quote,* p. 75. *and recommend to his Readers. But as the Reader by this Time muſt be ſufficiently convinced of his Arrogance and Conceit, as well as his Ignorace, I will forbear ſaying any more upon that Head for fear of offending our Author.*

Zachary Grey, L. L. D.

There he is in his proper Colours; if I had been born in the ſame Hovel, or bred in the ſame Village with them, I could not have known his Quality and Converſation better by it.

He opens his Invective on the *Crit. Hiſt. cap.* 7. with another notorious Falſity. I had ſaid Biſhop *Merks* of *Carliſle*, who made the Speech againſt the *Revolutional Right*, for which Mr. *Echard* ſo highly extols him, *entered into a Conſpiracy to make War on the Perſon of King* Henry IV. Upon this he ſays, *I take it for granted, this is a meer Fiction of our Critical Hiſtorian.* There he gives

me

me the *Lye* again; and I refer to any of any Denomination, whether this is not the moſt incorrigible Creature he ever met with. Biſhop *Godwin*, in his *Succeſſion* of *Engliſh Biſhops*, *p.* 680. Speaking of this *Merks*, has theſe Words; *Soon after his* Enlargement, *he joined with the* Hollands *and others in a Conſpiracy againſt King* Henry, *which being bewrayed to the Deſtruction of all the reſt, he only was pardon'd.* The Pope was ſo aſhamed of him, tho' our Doctor and our Archdeacon are not, that he turn'd him out of the Biſhoprick of *Carliſle*, and made him Biſhop of *Samos* in *Greece*.

The Parliament that was held the 5th of *Henry* IV. ordered a Bill to be brought in againſt the *Temporalities* of the *Clergy*, and that he rejected it: But the Attempt ſo offended the Eccleſiaſticks, that to be even with them, they nick-nam'd 'em the *Lack-Learning* Parliament; and I unwarily happen'd to ſay in Oppoſition to Mr. *Echard*, who jerks 'em a little for that Offence, *They had as much Learning as any of the preceeding Parliaments*; who inform'd him ſo, cries the Doctor? why truly his own dear ſelf; and if I had the leaſt Value for him in the World, I would tell him of a *Noſtrum* for Writing; which, tho' he could never improve by it, would be a Curioſity for him to know. That Dulneſs of his, will, I am afraid, be a perpetual Impediment to him in the Way of all ſorts of Improvement. I compared, an pleaſe ye, the Liſts of that *Lack-Learning Parliament* with others; and having no Books as Dr. *Zachary* affirms, I muſt do it by *Manuſcripts*; and having no *Manuſcripts*, as he ſays alſo, it muſt be by *Conjuration*; and not being a *Conjurer*, as he maliciouſly and groundleſly declares elſewhere, no Body will believe I could do it unleſs I ſhew'd how.

5th of *Hen.* IV. Lack-Learning Parl.

Bedford County, *Reginald Ragon*, choſen 3d and 4th of *Hen.* IV.

Bedford Town, *John Freepurſe*, choſen the 6th of *Hen.* VI.

Berks County, *Edmund Sperſholt*, choſen the 2d of *Hen.* VI.

Bucks County, *Edmund Brudenel*, choſen the 8th of *Hen.* IV.

Cornwall, *John Arundel*, 6, 8, 12 *Hen.* IV. 2, 3, 5, 7 *Hen.* V.

Cumberland, *Robert de Lowther*, the Name ſufficient.

Derby, *John Carſon*, the ſame.

Devon, *Thomas Pomeroy*, the ſame.

Dorſet, *Humphry Stafford*, the ſame.

Dorcheſter Burough, *John Furdaine*, choſen 2d *Hen.* V. 3d *Hen.* VI.

By which it appears that they were Members choſen before and after, and Men of the beſt Faſhion in their ſeveral Countries.

What a Rout does he make, becauſe I ſay *Jack Cade*, a Gentleman's Footman, who roſe in Defence of the *Hereditary Right*, was taken and *hanged* before his Head was cut off, when he was only killed before his Head was cut off. So let it be; and I don't care whether the Rebels to our happy Government are killed or hang'd before they are headed, provided Juſtice has any Way hold of 'em. Here again he quotes me unconſcionably, leaving out, " He was inſtructed " to uſe this Name, to ſound the Inclinations of " the People towards the Earl of *Cambridge*'s Ti- " tle, as Heir to *Mortimer*, Heir to *Lionel*, Duke " of *Clarence*, by *Philipa*, his Daughter, who mar- " ry'd the Lord *Mortimer*, and the Duke of *Cla-*

rence

"*rence* was elder Brother to *John* of *Gaunt*, Great "Grandfather to *Henry* VI." All this has he left out, and comes to *Cade*'s *Fortune*, *p.* 78. and as if there had been no such Sentence between it. There would be no great Matter in this Cheat, if it was not in favour of a barefaced Untruth, which he says in the next Page, *He is not capable of distinguishing between the Houses of* York *and* Lancaster. He had but just read this Title of the House of *York*, when he spoke so falsely, and so daringly.

When I mentioned the Duke of *York*'s Treason and Perjury, in the Reign of *Henry* VI. Mr. *Echard* and I agreed in that Matter; upon which I observed, In such a Channel runs the Divine Right of Lineal Descent; *for interrupting of which, Mr.* Echard *showers down his Judgments on the Royal Progeny.* "This is such Stuff, quoth Dr. *Zachary*, "that it plainly discovers the *Critical Historian* "is no Conjurer." He makes this vile Stuff of his own Worsted, and then puts it upon my Back. The Unjust Inference is his own. Mr. *Echard* says the Duke of *York* was guilty of Treason, *&c.* therefore *our Doctor makes me say*, He showered down his Judgments on the Royal House of *Lancaster*; which is every Word false, as appears at Sight. Did I not insinuate that Mr. *Echard* shower'd down these Judgments, not for declaring the Duke of *York* a Rebel, but for the House of *Lancaster*'s interrupting the unalienable, unalterable, indefeasible, hereditary Light. What is said of these Judgments, is two Pages before, and spoken of another Reign, and of the Death of *Henry* V. the Glory of the *English* Name, who dying in the Midst of his Conquests, Mr. *Echard* says, *Indeed there seems to be something of the more immediate Hand of God in it, which now began to chastise the Progeny of* Henry IV, who took the

Crown *Richard* the IId *abdicated*. This is not the only Judgment which Mr. *Echard* had in Store for the Houſe of *Lancaſter*. When *Hen.* VI's Miniſters committed an Overſight prejudicial to the *Lancaſter* Intereſt, he reflects, *The Eyes and Hearts of the Wiſeſt are blind when God deſigns a Secret Scourge*, and viſits to the Third and Fourth Progeny.

In the next Quotation he leaps forward 157 Pages to produce it maim'd and unfair. "All "the World, *ſays the Crit. Hiſt.* p. 78. knows "King *Charles* had been a Papiſt many Years, "which however Mr. *Echard* takes no Notice of, "the King having himſelf lately broken the Seal "*affix'd to the Toleration.*" Here again he's falſe; the Sentence is not mine, but what follows: *Echard, ſpeaking of the Earl of* Shaftsbury's *being turn'd out*, a few Lines after, extols the King's Zeal for the Proteſtant Religion; *which he leaves out*: All the World knows, *&c.* After he has committed this Fraud, he exclaims; *A bright Inſtance of our Criticks excellent Manner of Reaſoning.* As he is incapable of diſtinguiſhing, ſo Narration and Argumentation are with him the very ſame Thing. Was the turning out the Lord *Shaftsbury*, whom Mr. *Lock* ſtiles one of the Chief of the Proteſtant Lords, a Proof of King *Charles*'s Zeal for the Proteſtant Religion? The Archdeacon knew he was a Papiſt, and how could he extol the King's great Zeal for the Proteſtant Religion, without Grimace or Diſſimulation; and what other Reaſon could he have for it, but his perſecuting Diſſenters?

In the next Page 79, there is an *Errat.* of the Preſs, and *Of* ſhould be left out. 'Tis printed, Right Heir OF *Richard* Duke of *York*, and it ſhould be the Right Heir, *Richard*, Duke of *York*, as it was actually corrected by my ſelf in the *Errat.* but omitted at the Preſs. Upon this, our

our Doctor *Crows* like a true Cock of the Dunghil, and fills a Page or two, to prove that *Perkin Warbeck* was not *Richard Plantagenet*. A Piece of History well worth the Labour of such a Doctor as he is. I'm satisfied a Man of his Head, cannot distinguish between *Pen* Faults and *Press* Faults; and tho' he would not serve for a Corrector, he would do very well for a Critick upon such Slips, which is the most good he can do. The Printers would then mind their Business better.

Page 80. He quotes me for saying Mr. *Echard* says, King *Henry* VII. designed to make a Bishop of King *Henry* VIII. and Bishop *Burnet* said he did not design it. Here his Forehead shines again, and his Folly surprizes one. He wou'd again turn the History into a logical Argument, and blunders and falsifies without Measure. Read his own choice Expressions. *Here again we have a Specimen of our Author's close Reasoning.* Bishop Burnet *says, His Father made him a* Scholar, *without any Intention to make him Archbishop*; ERGO *the general receiv'd Opinion must be false in Fact: But why must Bishop* Burnet's *saying so, make it so? If he could prove Bishop* Burnet *infallible*; *which here will be a hard Matter to do, his Authority in this Case might pass for something*: *But why should not the Authority of our best Historians*, &c. The Stupidity and Sawcineſs are too strong for me: I can repeat no more of it. The Falshood is equally astonishing; he comes on us, *p.* 80. with three Interrogatories and an *Ergo*, when himself had read and left out the solid Proof, which makes the Bishop really *infallible* in this Matter. My Lords Words are these, his *Father had given Orders that both his elder Brother and he should be well instructed in Matters of Knowledge, not with any Design to make him Archbishop of* Canterbury, FOR HE HAD MADE SMALL PROGRESS *when his*

Brother dy'd. He gives ſo good a Reaſon for't, that he cannot be fallible in it; the King could not deſign it when he was next Heir to the Crown. If I was not ſo aſham'd of him, and ſo weary of him, I would beg him in caſe we could have future Commerce, that he would not quote ſuch Authorities as *Collier*, *Heylin*, *Brady*, *Dugdale*, *Wharton*, *Hicks*, nor his *Hiſtorian*, nor *Warwick*, nor *Heath*, nor *L'Eſtrange*, nor *Nalſon*, nor *Salmon*, nor his whole String of Authors: For I have enter'd a Caveat againſt 'em in the Court of Hiſtory; with reſerving to my ſelf the Privilege to add to the ſaid *Caveat* Dr. *Grey*, when he ſhall have done any Thing worth *Caveating*, and all of the ſame Faction that ſhall preſume to ſet up for *Hiſtoriographers*, without any the leaſt Licence from Genius or Truth.

The following Quotation is a *Numpril*; I know he'll ſay I don't underſtand *French*, and that I can't Spell; but the Word is too good for ſuch a one as he. I charg'd *Dugdale* with ſaying *Cromwell* Earl of *Eſſex* dy'd *little pity'd*; to prove it an Untruth, I gave an Inſtance of his being pity'd even by the King himſelf. Now ſee the *cloſe Reaſoner*. *Very likely he might be pity'd*, quo Dr. Zachary, *p.* 82. *and his dying* unheard be no Untruth; but his dying unpity'd was a notorious One. Sure the Man whom the King pity'd, could not be ſaid to dye without Pity! I told you he was a *Numpril*; he knows not what I mean by it; and after he has ſo ſaid, he goes on, and affirms, that the Crit. Hiſt. *has directly falſify'd the Fact*; for which he's an overbearing confident Fellow, *p.* 82. But *Zachary Grey* is a moſt modeſt, well-bred intelligent, learned —— L. L. D.

Again, *p.* 83. He charges me with being akin to him, and of the Dregs of the People: Nay, he's ſo fond of me, that he tells a ſtaring

Falſity

Falſity to prove it. *P.* 83. *He plentifully pour'd forth* Ribaldry *againſt the* reverend *the* Popiſh *Clergy, Monks, and Monaſteries, ſuch as* UNFROCKING *them, Language uſed only by* Porters, *and Perſons ſunk into the very Dregs of the* People. If he had any Eyes in his Head, or Guts in his Brains, that's the Language of the *Dregs*, and ſuitable to my Subject, himſelf the very Eſſence of 'em, he would have ſeen that I was ſpeaking of the Rabble, and had Reference to the Times when ſuch Terms were uſed. However, I dare ſay there is no Proteſtant in *Chriſtendom*, that would have been angry with me, had I apply'd *Unfrocking* and *Unkennelling* to the disbanding the Monks in King *Henry* VIII's Reign. *Honeſt John Fox*, an excellent Authority in this Caſe, among a thouſand other Paſſages, has this, *Vol.* II. *p.* 501. "To o-"mit the wicked and execrable Life of theſe "Religious Orders, full of *Fedity*, and found out "by the King's Viſitors, and in their Regiſters "alſo recorded, ſo horrible to be heard, ſo in-"credible to be believed, ſo ſhocking before the "Face of God and Man, that no Marvel it is, "if God's Vengeance from Heaven, provoked, "would not ſuffer any Stone or Monument of "theſe abominable Houſes to be unplucked up. "But as I ſaid, letting theſe Things paſs under "chaſte Silence, which for very Shame will ab-"hor any Story, let us, *&c.*" Tho' Mr. *Fox* was intimate with the greateſt Lords of the Court and Country, of whom there is a long Liſt in his Life; tho' he was Fellow of *Magdalen* College, *Oxon*; nay, and an Archdeacon too, and it is ſaid, might have been a Biſhop; yet for this very Paſſage will he be thrown among the Doctor's Dregs; but I hope he will not ſerve *Henry* VIII. ſo; eſpecially, ſince he was intended to be made Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*, according to him and

his Hiſtorian. The Rabble having raiſed the Rebellion ſpoken of in the *Crit. Hiſt.* the King, in his Anſwer to their Demands, ſpeaks thus of the Monks, *There be no Houſes ſuppreſſed where God was well ſerved, but where moſt Vice, Miſchief, and Abomination of Living was uſed; and that doth well appear by their own Confeſſions, ſubſcribed with their own Hands.* And now I will boldly ſay, in ſpite of the Doctor, that they were *unfrock'd* and *unkennel'd.*

As to the Stones with which *Somerſet-Houſe* was built; I will not concern my ſelf about them; let the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians ſettle that Affair among themſelves. I mentioned Mr. *Echard's* clearing the Duke of *Somerſet* of Sacrilege, and his charging him at the ſame Time with *demoliſhing Churches*; which I thought was a Contradiction. But here too Dr. *Zachary* thruſts in *Heylin* and *Collier* before him, to prove what Churches were *pulled down*; and according to theſe excellent Men, the *pulling of 'em down* was no *Sacrilege*, or *Echard* contradicts himſelf; which is no ſuch great Wonderment, as to make more Stir about it.

If I have ſplit *One* of Dr. *Whitgift's* Articles in *Two*, let Dr. *Grey* glew it together again. Let 'em be two of 'em or three of 'em, I ſhall never ſee them again I ſuppoſe, and am reſolved to leave Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory to thoſe that have ſublime Genius's fit for ſuch great and difficult Undertakings; which we muſt rather hope to ſee than expect. Neither will I take upon me the leaſt Drop of Mr. *Penry* of *Oxford's* innocent Blood, as I ſhould do by juſtifying the Warrant for his Execution, ſign'd by Archbiſhop *Whitgift*, and but two Laymen. He was of *Alban Hall, Oxford*; and there are ſome good Things ſaid of him in *A. Wood's Athen. Oxon.* p. 258.

Page 86. *He passes over Persons for* Puritans, *who in Reality were not so; as* Grindal: Is there any bearing of him! *Cox, Sands, Pilkington*: There's a daring Falsity! How Ignorant and Irreligious must this Doctor be, not to have read and remember'd Dr. *Henry Sacheverel*'s incomparable Sermon? he would have known then whether that most worthy Prelate, Archbishop *Grindal* was a *Puritan* or not, and whether Men of Piety and Charity have not ever since been from him term'd *Grindalizers*. The insolent *Heylin* is at the Head of those that have villify'd him for his divine Qualities, and called his Moderation *Grindalizing*; *See* Pref. to *Calamy*'s Baxter's *Life*. Every one but our *L. L. D.* knows the other Prelates were noted for his Principles; and we might add many other eminent Divines of our *Church*, as *Nowel*, *Whittingham*, *Cole*, *Humphry Turner*, *Horn*, *Jewel*; were it possible to confound him, I would go further, and affirm that the *Oxonians* themseles were not only *Puritans*, but zealous for *Puritanism*: *A. Wood*, ibid. *The* Vigour *of* Puritanism *did then reign among the* Heads *of the* University.

I am so fair an Historian, that tho' he thinks I have no Adoration in Store for Archbishop *Whitgift*, yet I will copy from the worst Author I ever did in my Life, to recommend to the Readers where they may read the the best of him.

Sir George Paul's *Life of Archbishop* Whitgift.
Heylin's *History of the* Presbyterians.
Collier's *Ecclesiastic. History.*

Dr. Zach. Grey, *Def.* p. 87.

He charges me, *p.* 87. with imitating Mr. *Prynne*, whose Works I never read, his *Kalendar* only excepted, in his *Libellous* Way of Writing.

Had

Had there been any Thing to be got by reading *Prynne*, he would have ſworn I had never ſeen it; and now I have not read him, I am exactly like him; as if *Eſtcourt* could have look'd like a Man whom he never ſaw. Dr. *Grey* has but a very ſmall Faculty of Thinking; but as ſmall as it is, 'tis wonderful out of the Way. If you have a Mind to read any Thing of the *Presbyterians*, Dr. *Zachary* recommends you to *Heylin* and *Collier*, p. 95. and having given the Reader ſuch a Bleſſing, he ends his firſt Part.

I hope I ſhall be excuſed to all Men of Senſe and Manners, for the Treatment Dr. *Zachary* meets with here. The many notorious Falſities I have, and ſhall prove upon him, teach one to uſe Phraſes equal to his Character; and tho' I take no Pleaſure in it, I can by no Means bring my ſelf to mix clean Language with his dirty; which would be like putting on clean Linnen to rake in a Kennel.

He ſkreens himſelf, *p.* 98. with the Lord *Clarendon*'s Reputation. Be that as it will, he knows not why my Lord is ſo valuable, nor can he diſtinguiſh what is admirable in his Hiſtory from what is not. I have large Collections by me of Inſtances, wherein he differs from *Whitlock*, whom even Dr. *Grey* owns to be a *fair Writer*, and from *Ruſhworth*, who has that Character from every Body whoſe good Word is worth having. But 'tis an ungrateful, and an unthankful Office; and one could expect no other Hiſtory from an Author, who wrote it in Exile, in the Height of Reſentment, and left it to be publiſhed by the *Oxford* Men. Indeed, for Mr. *Echard*, whoſe Patrons were moſtly Men of *Revolutional* Principles, who have Benefices and Benefits from the Government, to treat thoſe Principles

on

on which it is founded, and the Aſſertors of 'em, in the Manner he has done, argues Diſingenuity and Ingratitude. Our Doctor hopes *He* will talk with the *Crit. Hiſtorian* himſelf, in whoſe Name I venture to promiſe, that the *Critical Hiſtorian* will talk with him, if he does not diſown the Libel which Dr. *Zachary* has fathered; for there are ſeveral Paſſages in it, that ſhew in what Ground they grew, and that the Soil was as rank in ſome Places, as barren in others. Tho' much is to be dreaded from the dead-doing Pen of his favourite Hiſtory Writer, yet I will be ſo frank as to inform them both, that the Second Volume of the *Crit. Hiſtory* is in good Forwardneſs, and will conſiſt entirely of a *Review* of the Archdeacon's Prefaces and Introductions, and a Compariſon of his Hiſtory with the Lord Commiſſioner *Whitlock*'s; ſo that if he ſtays till it comes out, he may kill two Birds with one Stone, and anſwer two Volumes in one. But I confeſs, as theſe Anſwerers manage themſelves, they may do it before they come out, as well as after: For they make one ſpeak what they pleaſe; and being always well furniſhed with Scurrility and Aſſurance, they have ſuch Anſwers as our Doctor's at their Fingers Ends.

He begins his Second Part like himſelf; the very firſt Quotation is falſe, and ſo alſo is his Remark. He puts theſe Words into the *Crit. Hiſt. In the four following Reigns there is no Hiſtory upon which the Reader can depend.* This is falſly quoted, and there's as much Mettal in it as in the Forehead of the Statue at *Charing-Croſs*. I ſaid there's no Hiſtory *of the four following Reigns* upon which one may depend. There are ſeveral ſuch Hiſtories *in* thoſe Reigns, as *Ruſhworth*, *Whitlock*, *Hollis*, *Locke*, *Calamy*, *Marvel*, to whom we might add, *Ludlow*, *Baxter*, *Jones*, *Coke*, *Walker*, *Philips*, *Temple*,

ple, and others, who wrote Parcels of that Period. Either he knows not the Difference between *of* and *in*, or his Conſcience will let him do any thing when his Malice is at Work. In the ſame Paragraph, *p.* 98. he reflects thus: "In this ge-"neral Charge, I don't find that the great Bi-"ſhop *Burnet* his Favourite, (*thank ye, Mr. Doctor,*) "who has written upon three of thoſe Reigns, is "excepted, tho' he afterwards flouriſhes ſo much "upon his Character." I beg the Reader to conceive, if he can, what a Front he muſt have, to tell *Three* in a Breath, and then glory as if he had gain'd a Triumph over ſomething elſe beſides Modeſty and Truth. This is ſo ſurprizingly falſe, that my Lord of *Salisbury* is *excepted* in the very next Words of all, as he quotes them himſelf: *'Tis true, there are many Exceptions to this Obſervation, and my Lord of* Salisbury's *late Hiſtory is an unqueſtionable One.* Again; for there's nothing in Print like it; *So that notwithſtanding our Author's contrary Aſſertion, we have a Hiſtory* in Biſhop Burnet's, *which may be ſecurely relied upon.* Here's Inference! Becauſe Biſhop *Burnet* wrote only Three Reigns of the Four, as Dr. *Grey* tells us, therefore we may rely ſecurely upon the other Reign which he did never write. Add to this, he jumps from *p.* 161 to *p.* 170, to tack thoſe two falſe Quotations as near as he cou'd together, and make 'em look like a Contradiction.

In his following Paragraph, there is a double Contention between Falſhood and Inſolence, Ignorance and Ill-manners, for the Preheminence. "I queſtion whether he ever ſaw any one Manu-"ſcript relating to *Engliſh Hiſtory*, his Book being "drawn from the very Dregs of our *Hiſtory*, which "makes it to uſe an Expreſſion of *Hiſtory*. *Mind*, "*his Eloquence* ſmells ſo much of the Cask, and "he has ſtoop'd to ſuch mean and pitiful Re-"marks,

"made, as ſufficiently ſhew'd he'd pump'd him-
"ſelf to the Bottom, and that his Malice was up-
"on the Lees," *&c.* I found out what he was by his Breeding and Language, before I knew otherwiſe whether he was a Man or a Monkey. His Information as to the *Critical Hiſtory*, probably comes from the *Archdeacon*, to whom that Author recommended one of the moſt valuable Manuſcripts relating to King *Charles* II's Reign, mention'd by himſelf, *p.* 879. I hate the *Eternel Moy* ſpoken of by the *French* Criticks, and all Sorts of *Egotiſms*, or elſe I'm ſatisfy'd this very Doctor could not help bluſhing at what might be ſaid on this Occaſion.

All I ſhall ſay of *Echard*'s Story of the *Devil and Oliver Cromwell*, is, that it ſtands in his Book ſtill, and takes up Part of two Folio Columns, *p.* 691. He tells us *Echard* calls it a *Redundancy* or *Exceſcence*: I believe they are the Archdeacon's own Words, becauſe in Two, there's One more than was neceſſary. But what then? Muſt we run every Time to his *Appendix*, when the *Devil* and *Cromwell* are haunting us? Why has he not ſtruck it out of his Hiſtory, as he promis'd to do, when he was corrected? And as for thoſe diſcreet Perſons who, he tells us, are willing to have it ſtand, there's the Dæmon of *Tedworth*, and a hundred better Stories, to divert and improve them. I have almoſt done with him. What he has to ſay in Applauſe of the Reigns of King *James* I. King *Charles* I. King *Charles* II. and King *James* II. is anſwer'd by every Hiſtory of thoſe Times, which is too well known, to be dwelt upon here. Let him find out Encomiums for them where he can, I'll not hunt after him, I don't like the Scent ſo well. The *Hiſtory of a Standing Army* was not written by a Courtier: The Writer intended to perplex King *William* and his Miniſtry, by oppoſing a *Regular*

Force;

Force; and his Book was mightily cry'd up by Dr. *Zachary*'s Friends. However, without knowing, or thinking any thing of the Matter, he falls to answering him as he answers me, *p.* 111. that is, he calls him *Libeller* and *Villain*.

He would drive me back to Bishop *Spotswood* for the Story of Earl *Gowrie*'s Tragedy; but I won't be driven. I'll take *Osburn*'s Word, who says *this fell* out *upon August* 5; *on which many* Lies *were told in the Choir* of St. *Paul*'s about that *new Holy-Day*: And if Archbishop *Spotswood* and Dr. *Grey* can prove there were never any told there, I will no more take Mr. *Osburn*'s Word: But as he was a Gentleman, an *Englishman*, and never got a Farthing by King *James* I. which cannot be said of the Archbishop; his Authority is good to me, notwithstanding Dr. *Zachary* has no less than three or four Pages about it out of *Scotch* History. Further, he makes Two Blots, one of the Father, and another of the Son, and says I have confounded them. To explain my self, I mean Mr. *Osburn*'s New *Holy-Day* Plot, when the *Lyes* were told in St. *Paul*'s, and no other.

It is very hard at first to repeat such a filthy Word as *Lye*, for a Man that has had any other Breeding and Conversation than our *L. L. D.* I scarce ever met with it in History but once, and that is when another Doctor *Sydeserfe*, the *Scotch* Bishop of *Ross*, made so by Dr. *Laud*'s Interest, gave the Earl of *Argyle* the *Lye* at the Council Table. Whoever has a Mind to see the short *History of Standing Armies*, wherein the *Four Reigns* are described, may turn to *p.* 657, *&c. seq.* in the Second Volume of *State Tracts*. The *Critical Historian* took 'em thence *Verbatim*; and again desires they may be compared with the Earl of *Clarendon* and Mr. *Echard*. Dr. *Grey* cannot tell but the Author was a Man of Quality; and whether he

he was ſo or not, every Thing ſhews him to be at leaſt his Superior: And thus it is that he treats him, *p.* 111. ſpeaking of his Hiſtory; *As compleat a* LYE *from the Beginning to the End, as the fertile Brain of the wicked Author could contrive, or the* DEVIL *himſelf could ſuggeſt.* This is follow'd by the Character of King *Charles* I. A bleſſed Tongue to ſpeak a Panegyrick of the Royal Martyr! He ſhan't draw me in to add a Word to the *Short Hiſtory*; there's enough: And a very late Inſtance has given me a Surfeit of that Subject. Since he ſo often quotes Sir *Philip Warwick*, let's ſee what is ſaid of him in *A. Wood*'s *Athen. Oxon.* Vol. I. *p.* 278. *He never lyes more than when he ſpeaks the Sincerity of his Heart.* Whatever I have to ſay to confirm any ſuch Pieces of *Hiſtory*, muſt be publiſhed with ſuch Poſthumous Pieces as my Executors may think worth Printing, tho' perhaps the World may not.

Page 120. He goes about to prove that Dr. *Montague*'s Cauſe was the Cauſe of the Church, and brings in *Montague* to be a Witneſs on his own Side, which has clear'd that Matter excellently well.

Page 121. produces an Encomium by Sir *Philip Warwick*; to which I refer the Reader, and acquaint him, that a *Some ſay* ſhould be added to the *Crit. Hiſt.* p. 199. according to Dr. *Zachary*. Well, let him add it then, if 'tis ſo in *Whitlock*; but I know what is not ſo in *Whitlock*. The very next Quotation of our honeſt Doctor's is out of him. He aſſures us, *p.* 122. with his wonted Boldneſs; *Whitlock*, p. 32. *ſays of him, He was too full of Fire, but a juſt and good Man. Whitlock*, the *Memorialiſt*, does not ſay one Word of it: On the contrary, he writes thus, " The chief Blame and Odium of all, was " by many laid upon Archbiſhop *Laud*, who was

" more

" more busy in Temporal Matters, and Affairs " of State, than his Predecessors of later Times. Indeed, Judge *Whitlock* did say thus of *Laud*; " He was too full of Fire, though a just and " good Man, and that his want of Experience " in State Matters, and his too much Zeal for " the Church, and Heat, if he proceeded in the " Way he was in, would set this Nation on " Fire." Now read *Collier*, *Heylin*, *Wharton*, *Grey*, and the whole Knot of them; compare this setting the *Nation on Fire*, spoken by Judge *Whitlock*, with *Echard*'s *Dove-like* Meekness and Innocence. As for Religion and Piety, I expect it not from them. I know what stands in stead of it; some of the Zeal aforesaid; but Common Sense and Common Honesty one would expect. Is there any Thing more contrary to the Divine Spirit and Function, than to be busy about Temporal Matters; of which he had small Experience? and can any Thing be more inconsistent than a *Saint* and an *Incendiary*? I can't help it; I had it from Judge *Whitlock*, in the very Page and Paragraph which Dr. *Zachary* has falsly quoted.

In the next Quotation, he brings *Collier* in with him as a Proof, that Dr. *Leighton*, Father of the Seraphick Archbishop of *Glasgow*, deserved to *be Jayled as long as the King pleased, to pay ten thousand Pound, to be twice barbarously whipp'd, to have both his Ears cut off, to have his Nose slit, his Face stigmatized*, &c. for calling the Queen *Canaanite*, that is as much as to say *French Woman*, and *Idolatress*, that is as much as to say *Papist*. We need not mention Dr. *Laud*'s being in this barbarous and bloody Business. I'll leave it to Mr. *Echard* to determine whether he was not one of *Leighton*'s Judges.

Page

Page 124. we have another Paragraph by Sir *Philip Warwick*; it is upon Dr. *William Jane*: All that I had to say of him was and is, That he being of the Holy Vocation, the Minister of God's Word, call'd to it by the Holy Spirit, did so far incumber himself with worldly Affairs, as to undertake the Management of the publick Treasure; and I did insinuate, and do so again, that the Practice of the Primitive Bishops, when the Church of Christ was in its *Purity* affords no such Example; and I wanted Instruction, and do still want it to inform me how a Man who makes a Conscience of discharging his sacred Duty, after a Call to the Ministry, can involve himself in Temporal Matters to such a Degree as to take on him the Office of Lord High Treasurer of *England*. I think what *Whitlock* writes of him is much more defensible, *p.* 23. That *at his Parsonage of* Somerton *in* Oxfordshire, *he kept a Pack of good Hounds, and had them so well ordered, and chiefly by his own Skill and Direction, that they exceeded all other Hounds in* England. He adds to his Praise, *He had as much Command of himself as his Hounds.*

In Page 126, is Sir *Philip Warwick*'s Character of Mr. *Prynne*; but his Picture is so coarse, one wou'd think 'twas rather laid on with a Trowel than with a Pencil. He again brings in *Collier* to witness for him, *p.* 127. These Men are all of a Piece, and it can't be otherwise: Such a Cause must have such Advocates, and none but dirty Workmen are fit to be set about dirty Work. *Collier* join'd with *Cook* and *Snat* to absolve a Traytor and an *Assassin* at the *Gallows*. So detestable a Piece of Wickedness and Impudence that the Reverend the Fathers of our Church, as my Lord of *Canterbury*, Dr. *Sharp* Archbishop of *York*, Dr. *Compton* Bishop of *London*, Dr. *Crew* Bishop of *Durham*, Dr. *Mew* Bishop of *Winchester*, and Nine

Biſhops more, publiſh'd a Declaration againſt thoſe Three abſolving Prieſts, of whom *Collier* was foremoſt! In which Declaration they are term'd *Scandals* of the *Church* and *Religion*; and it is ſaid Dr. *Zachary*'s *Collier*, and his two Brethren were *pretended Members of the Church of England*; and what is Dr. *Grey* I wonder! Their Lordſhips conclude, *We diſown and deteſt all ſuch Principles, looking upon them as highly Schiſmatical and Seditious*, dangerous *both to the Church and State, and contrary to the true Doctrine and Spirit of the Chriſtian Religion.* This Schiſmatick *Collier* does Dr. *Zachary* produce to bear his Teſtimony for our Orthodox Church and Churchmen.

He labours very much, *p.* 131, 132. to prove Sir *Edward Deering* a Turncoat; perhaps he was. I only repeated what he ſaid of Biſhop *Laud*, *His Grace will have more Grace or no Grace*, &c. I am not ſo much in Love with the Speech as to repeat it again.

I do ſtill tell Dr. *Zachary* that *Robert Harley*'s Name was not *Robert Harlow*, *Vide* Liſt of the Long Parl. County *Hereford*. *This Error the* Critical Hiſtorian *corrected for* Echard, *as may be ſeen by his* Index.

We come now to one of the fineſt Tracts that ever the Party publiſhed, and that is, *A Dialogue between the Croſs in Cheap, and the Croſs at Charing*. He prints a good deal of it, *p.* 133. and it is from ſuch Magazines that he ſteals his little Wit as the *Criſs-Croſs* in the *Horn-Book*, p. *ibid.* and other inoffenſive *Croſſes*.

Page 135. is a Quotation out of the *Crit. Hiſt.* about Lord *Digby*'s appearing in Arms at *Kingſton*; upon which Mr. *Echard* endeavour'd to be as witty as Dr. *Grey* is upon the *Croſſes*; and to demonſtrate that *Whitlock* is not in the Right, *p.* 52. when he ſays the *Lord* Digby *and Col.* Lunsford

were gathering ſome Troops of Horſe at Kingſton, he has the Matter try'd by the Lord *Digby* himſelf, and repeats above three Pages of his Apology.

If he thinks I ſhall be at any Pains to prove that the Parliamentarians were not *Papiſts*, or that *Cromwell* was not a Coward, which he puts me upon, *p.* 138, 140. he is miſtaken; nor will I believe King *Charles* the Firſt's Troop of Guards were richer Men than the Lords and Commons in Parliament aſſembled, as *Echard* ſaid, and as he vouches for him, notwithſtanding Sir *Philip Warwick*, with whom he will never have done, is his *Back* for ſome Part of it. The ſilly Man inſults me for ſaying only the *Earl of Eſſex* had the *Advantage* of the King at *Edge-hill*; and then to evince that he had not, he quotes *Whitlock*, who tells us the Earl gain'd a *full Victory*, p. 142. His Conſcience and his Head open and ſhut ſo that they can't hold together for two Lines: He will be always falſifying or blundering. The next Quotation is about Mr. *Echard*'s Judgment ſhowered down upon Mr. *Hampden* in *Chalgrave Field*, which Dr. *Grey* affirms is as it ſhou'd be, and a *Judgment* it was, for putting on his beſt Coat firſt in that very Field, where one of the King's Soldiers ſhot him. All the Parliament's Army cou'd not well be kill'd in the ſame Places where they were firſt muſter'd, or elſe the ſame Judgment wou'd have made an End of all of 'em. *In Seventeen of his Aſſembly Doctors he is only miſtaken in Ten*, quoth *Zachary Grey*, L. L. D. Now I am not miſtaken in One of them that follow: They are every one *Doctors* of *Divinity* in *Calamy*'s Abridgment. See their Names in the *Index* to the Second Volume, and other Parts of both Volumes where they are nam'd.

William Taylor, D. D. *Francis Cheynel*, D. D.
William Gouge, D. D. *Humphry Chambers*, D. D.
Tho. Temple, D. D. *Edmund Staunton*, D. D.
Lazarus Seaman, D. D. *Peter Smith*, D. D.
Anthony Tuckney, D. D. *John Arrowsmith*, D. D.
Henry Wilkinson, Sen. D. D. *Edward Reynolds*, D. D.
Henry Wilkinson, Jun. D. D. *Cornelius Burgess*, D. D.
William Spurstow, D. D.

Every one of these Doctors had their Degree before the *Assembly*, or during their Session, or after *Oliver* dissolved them with the Parliament. They are so call'd by Dr. *Calamy*, as is above asserted; and yet this modest ingenious Doctor affirms Ten of those Divines were not *Doctors*. The contrary of which we have prov'd from *Calamy*, who has copied the *Record* Dr. *Grey* pretends to quote as if he had taken it out of those in the Tower. Whether they had been *Doctors* or not, they were most of them, and of the whole Assembly, Men of Learning and Piety; some of 'em also distinguished themselves by their Loyalty; Mr. *Case* being imprison'd for a Plot against *Cromwell*, in Favour of King *Charles* II. Is he not asham'd to join King *Charles* Ist's Works, *p.* 145. with *Heylin*'s History of the *Presbyterians*, as Evidence that the Assembly were a Parcel of sorry Fellows? There is another of his best Authorities *Peter Heylin*, D. D. In *A. Wood*'s Account, *Athen. Oxon.* we read this of him; *He was very conceited and pragmatical, of a very mean Port and Presence, bold and undaunted, too high and proud for his Function: In a Word, too much a Party* to be an *Historian*: And Bishop *Barlow*, speaking of *A. Wood* the Oxonian, and this *Peter Heylin*, "The "first Specimen of this Author's Abilities, *A. Wood*, "was *Antiquit. Univers. Oxon.* in which there is "not only false *Latin* but false *English* too, and

"many

" many bad Characters caſt on good Men, eſpe-
" cially on the *Antinomians*, who are all, eſpeci-
" ally Dr. *Prideaux*, made ſeditious Perſons and
" Schiſmaticks, if not Hereticks: Nay our own firſt
" *Reformers*, out of *Peter Heylin*'s angry, and, to our
" Church and Truth, ſcandalous Writings, are
" made *Fanaticks*. How like they are to one another, and how unlike the Miniſters of the true Proteſtant Church of *England*, whom, however they crowd in among as often as they are in Queſtion! *Honeſt John Fox* is ſo treated by *Zachary Grey*. His admired *Collier*, and his adored *Heylin* are ſaid to be *Scandals* to the *Church* by the Fathers of it; yet both the Law *Doctor* and the Archdeacon boldly quote them as Authorities. Theſe have I ferreted out of their Holes, and pluck'd off the Vizard of Zeal from them, under which appears the counterfeit Churchmen, to be the Shame and Diſgrace of the ſacred Name.

He cannot ſpeak Truth, tho' about a Trifle. I ſaid, Echard *rather takes Meaſure of* Cromwell *like a Taylor, than deſcribes him as an Hiſtorian*; and he falſly quotes it thus; *He takes Meaſure of him like a Taylor, and then deſcribes him as an Hiſtorian*. He leaves out *rather*, and puts in *then*, which not only alters the Senſe, but turns the Hiſtorian directly into a Taylor, which was not my Intention. Then comes a new Dreſſing of *Cromwell*'s *Coat, Shirt, Band, Hat, Hatband, Sword*, &c. all out of Order. Theſe Writers, I perceive, are better Valets than they are Authors; and as to the *Doctor*, by his Language and Manners, one would take him for no other. The Proofs of *Oliver*'s Coat, Waſtcoat, and Breeches, *&c.* are taken firſt out of *Memoirs*; Sir *Philip Warwick*'s once more; and ſecondly, out of a *Sermon*; Dr. *South*'s. The Stile of which, as well as the Sentiments, being extremely edifying, *p.* 148. a *Bankrupt beggarly Fellow*,

low, with a thread-bare torn Cloak, a greasy Hat upon Tick, &c. Is it to hear such Stuff as this that People went to Church? There's more Wit in many Ballads, and more Instruction in many Almanacks.

Page 149. He tells us Mr. *Selden* translated a Book without understanding the Language, and, as if he had been a *Saracen* himself, he corrects Mr. *Selden*'s Translation of an *Arabic* Word. The Glory of our Nation is charg'd with mistaking or perverting his Author's Sense, with being a Fool, or a Knave, and imposing upon his Readers. Would one have a good Word from a Dabbler, that cou'd speak so bad a One of the great *Selden*?

We are a second Time told, that one Mr. *Slater* has knock'd down a Book call'd, *An Enquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, Unity and Worship of the Primitive Church.* But his saying so, shall not draw me in to read the unanswerable Answer of the said Mr. *Slater*. I know the *Enquiry* too well for that, and what rare Work such an Answerer must make of it, when the Fact and the Argument, unless wrested and torn, as *Zachary Grey* has serv'd me, are against him?

In Quotation, *p.* 150. and his Remark upon it, his *Metal* is burnished up again, and one of the most senseless Untruths that ever was utter'd keeps his Hand in. I mention'd a Speech of the Lord Marquis of *Hertford*'s at the Treaty of *Uxbridge*, where his Lordship seem'd to lay no Stress on the *Jure Divino* of *Prelacy* or *Presbytery*; and I ask'd Mr. *Echard*, why he did not insert it? *Zachary Grey* vouches for him, *because he had no good Authority for it.* Here he contradicts himself, to commit this Falsity, he having acknowledged *Whitlock* to be a good Authority; and the Marquis of *Hertford*'s Speech is Word for Word in *Whitlock*'s

Memorials, p. 123. with this Addition; *The Earl of* Pembroke *was of the ſame Opinion.* As to his Hiſtorian's Authority, I remember a Saying reported of King *William* to *Hamilton*, who had betray'd him, after the Battle of the *Boyne*. *Hamilton* being taken Priſoner, his Majeſty ask'd him, Whether he thought ſuch a Body of the *Iriſh* Army wou'd ſtand? *Hamilton* reply'd, *Yes, upon my Honour. Your Honour!* ſaid the King, and turn'd from him. Dr. *Zachary*, to make me a Forger of this very Speech, tells us, he has been looking about for it, and cannot find it either in *Eikon Baſilike*, nor in *Dugdale*'s View, nor in my Lord *Clarendon*, nor any where elſe. Therefore, *p.* 151. *it is no better than another Lye of his own making.* It will not bear Reflection.

Let his Admirers, if ſuch Animals there be, think what they will of *Eikon Baſilike*, I will not conteſt who is the Author: It has been ſo often and ſo well conteſted, there's no Room left for Doubt, and it is given up by every one that has had any Curioſity about it. Page 151. The Abridgment of *Montroſs's Life is very little more than what the* Crit. Hiſt. *took from Mr.* Echard's *Index*; and how could he do better than to take from himſelf, the *Critical Hiſtorian* having made that very *Index?* A Secret Dr. *Grey* was not let into; nor that he was the ſole *Editor* of the *Compleat Hiſtory of* England, wrote all the *Notes*, ſeveral of the *Reigns*, and the entire *Index*. This Work the Law Doctor ſpeaks of, inſinuating, that the Hiſtorian was a Stranger to it. So, in another Place, he upbraids him with his not having ſeen Dean *Prideaux's Connection*, when he ſaw it printed before the *Dean* himſelf did, and aſſiſted conſiderably in its Publication. All theſe Things are a kind of *Egotiſms*; but it was neceſſary to ſay ſo much, that the Reader may be confirm'd in the

Opinion

Opinion he has conceiv'd of Dr. *Zachary's* Capacity, Modesty, Manners, and Learning. The Latter will further appear in a Catalogue of his Books, *p.* 151.

Princely Pelican.
Walker's *Answer to* Lilly *the Almanack Maker.*
Dugdale's *View.*
Long's *Review of* Baxter.
Long's *Answer to Dr.* Walker.
Milton's Iconoclastes *answered.*
Restitution *to the* Royal Author.
Young's *Evidences.*
Wagstaff's *Vindication.*
Wagstaff *defended against* Toland.
Barwick's *Life*, &c.

These are the Cream of his Closet.

The next *Encomium*, taken again from Sir *Philip Warwick*, is upon the Marquis of *Montross*, consisting of about three Pages; but as I've not read 'em, I can't tell what's in them.

I was a little angry with Archdeacon *Echard* for not printing the *Protestation* of the *Presbyterian* Ministers against the King's *Tryal* and *Death*. The Fact is true, they did *protest*, and they are not asham'd. Dr. *Zachary* does not care a Farthing for this *Protestation*; he produces several Quotations, *English* and *Latin*, to prove that they cut off the King's Head, at the same Time that they preach'd and protested boldly and warmly against it, in such Expressions as these: "They were wholly "unsatisfy'd with the Proceedings, since the Ex- "clusion and Imprisonment of the Members "of the House of Commons; and held them- "selves bound in Duty to God, Religion, the "King, Parliament, and Kingdom, to profess "before God, Angels and Men, that they "verily believe the taking away the Life of the "King in the Way of Tryal now depending, was

"nor

" not only not agreeable to any Word of God, " the Principles of the Proteſtant Religion, never " yet ſtain'd with the leaſt Drop of the Blood of " a King, or to the Fundamental Conſtitution of " the Kingdom, but CONTRARY to them, *&c.*" This Paper they deliver'd to the General of the Army in a Council of War; *A plain running a great Hazard, as Things then ſtood*, ſays Dr. *Calamy*, *and may be juſtly reckon'd an Evidence of the great Integrity and Honeſty of the Perſons that ſubſcrib'd it.* There is nothing in Hiſtory ſo certain, as that the *Presbyterians* very boldly and ſolemnly enter'd their *Proteſt* againſt the King's Tryal and Death; nothing ſo certain, as that none but the *Presbyterians* did *reſtore*, or cou'd have *reſtor'd* his Son King *Charles* II. And yet how cruelly, how wickedly, have they been treated for it! Not by the true Sons of the Church; they will always be look'd upon by ſuch as their *Proteſtant Brethren*; but by the *Scandals* to it, ſuch as *Heylin*, *Collier*, our Doctor, and others of that Kidney. *Dugdale* too blackens them on this Occaſion, as much as the Malice of Man is capable of. P. 156. *Zachary Grey*'s Defence: *What did the* Independents *more to him by* MURDERING *him, than was done by the* Presbyterians, who moſt inhumanely tormented him, *by a lingering and diſconſolate Impriſonment, wherein he was in perpetual Fear of Murder, by Piſtol, Dagger, or Poyſon*, &c.? I have ſaid before, that the True Sons of our Church abhor ſuch uncharitable Reflections: So alſo do her learned and pious Fathers. What follows are the Words of a Prelate now living, (*K. H. E. V.* 3. *p.* 175.) and therefore not nam'd: *In Juſtice to the greater Part of the* Presbyterian *Miniſters, it muſt be acknowledg'd, that when they ſaw too late the ſad Iſſue of Things, they did then labour to prevent the execrable Fact of putting the King to Death.* *Dugdale* in that

that ſame Harangue againſt the *Presbyterians*, can't help ſhewing his Devotion to Monkery and Monaſteries, by a Fling at the Suppreſſion of them, tho' he ſpeaks of other Religious Foundations. They wou'd have *extorted a Conſent from him to the ſacrificing the Lands of the Church to their greedy Appetites, aiming therein, as much as in them lay, the Ruin of his Soul, by making him a Robber of God.* How is that tremendous Name profan'd, by appropriating it to the paltry Intereſts of lewd Fryars and Nuns! Again, and *thereby pulling upon him all thoſe heavy Curſes denounced by the pious Donors upon the Violaters of their devout Gifts.* This is *Dugdale*, whom you hear ſo much of in Mr. *Echard* and *Zachary Grey*. I have nothing to do with him as Author of the *Baronage* and *Warwickſhire*; laborious and uſeful Works. What I remark'd, is on his *Hiſtory of the Troubles*, which is indeed remarkable for Deficiency and Partiality, and on his malignant Zeal againſt the Liberty of our Conſtitution, Spiritual and Temporal.

Dr. *Zachary* is come, *p.* 159. to the Murther of Mr. *Aſcham*, the *Engliſh* Reſident in *Spain*; and in Favour of the Murtherers, has no leſs than ſix Pages upon that infamous Story. He doubts not his Account of the Tragedy will be credited, becauſe it is taken from the Earl of *Clarendon*, whoſe Servant *Henry Progers* was one of the Aſſaſſins. The Earl himſelf was at that Time Ambaſſador from King *Charles*, who was then in Poſſeſſion of no Kingdom, and Mr. *Aſcham* was Reſident from the Powers of *England*, then the moſt formidable in *Europe*. Thus the Earl had but an ill Lay of it againſt his Competitor Mr. *Aſcham*, and he treated him accordingly. Some *Engliſh* Mercenaries in the *Spaniſh* Service, together with his Servant *Progers*, conſulted *to kill this Fellow*, ſays my Lord *Clarendon*; and again, for ſuch a FELLOW as that to appear there,

there. This is the Way; the little Insects, the very Vermin of the Party learn this Air; and, as unbecoming as it is in Persons of my Lord's exalted Character and Merit, Dr. *Zachary* apes it, and is as awkward as he's insolent. Cannot one see the partial and ungenerous Usage the Lord *Clarendon* shews on this dismal Occasion? *Mr.* Ascham, says *A. Wood*, Vol. II. p. 385. *was born of a* Genteel *Family, educated at* Eaton *School, and thence elected into* King's *College in* Cambridge, *where he took the Degree of Master of Arts: He was afterwards made Tutor to* James *Duke of* York. He was a Man of good Learning and Parts; but being likely to make a better Figure in the Court of *Madrid* than my Lord, it is to *kill this Fellow*, and *such a Fellow* again; while the Popish Mercenaries that murder'd him, have this mild Language, *Those unhappy Gentlemen, Foot-Soldiers*, probably and *Footmen*; and the Murder itself is only styl'd *Rashness* by him, *p.* 168. The Pope's Nuncio stood by the Assassins, as well as some others that shall be nameless. For my Part, if *Forster* or *Mackintosh* had been assassin'd in that horrible Manner, I shou'd have been very glad to have seen the Assassins hang'd on the same Gallows which they are fled from. Let Justice take Place in its due Course; but Blood is guiltless till 'tis tainted; and let those that delight in it, enlarge upon this Story.

The History of *Cromwell*'s Carcass and Coffin, is in Page 164. Such another delightful Subject taken from *Dugdale* and *Heath*, very fit for such History.

As to *Monk*'s Pedigree, I never said it was false. I knew it better than he did, from an Ensign *in* King *William*'s Army, who was *Monk*'s Cousin, and has brag'd of his Birth, when, God knows, he had little to keep Life in him. I only intimated,

ted, that it was a whimſical Genealogy, from the *Plantagenets*; and if Mr. *Webſter* has proved it not to be ſo, I am ſatisfy'd. No Body ever doubted his being born of a good and ancient Family; but every Gentleman of *Wales* is not of the Blood of the *Tudors*.

Sir *Henry Vane*'s Death is the next which Dr. *Grey* glories in. I ſaid *p.* 259. In Mr. *Echard*, he died in a *very diſcompoſed Manner*; In Biſhop *Burnet*, with *more than ordinary Compoſedneſs*. As to the Soldiers beating their *Drums* about Sir *Henry Vane*'s Ears, in the laſt Minutes of his Life, it was not ſo bad as their ſtriking their bloody Daggers into Mr. *Aſcham*'s, and the *Spaniard*'s Head and Heart; in the telling of which our Doctor takes ſo much Pleaſure, that he's longer about it than any one Tale he has told.

After Sir *Henry Vane*'s Head was cut off, he hangs up *Philips*, *Tongue*, *Gibs*, and *Stubs*, for a Plot, which he affirms *I have a Mind to ſlur over as a Fictitious One*. He's not ſo confident here as he's fooliſh. I had no Mind to ſlur it over, becauſe it was ſlur'd enough before. *Vol.* I. of Dr. *Calamy*'s *Baxt. Life*, p. 305. *As ſoon as the Act of Uniformity took Place, more Plots were* hatch'd, *to keep up the ſame Spirit, as* Yarrington's *Plot firſt ſtirr'd up* Thomas Tongue, George Philips, Nathaniel Gibbs, &c. *who were try'd for* High Treaſon, *and condemned. An Account of it was publiſhed, entitled*, A Brief Narrative of that Stupendious Tragedy, late intended to be acted by the *Satanical Saints* of theſe Reforming Times. *But whoever reads their Trial, will ſee Reaſon to conclude, that the Court was very willing they ſhould be thought guilty, to inflame the Populace againſt ſuch as did not fall in with the Church of* England. I did ſay, and do again ſay, I *could have been merry with this Plot, had not the Cruelty of the Times turned it into a* Tragedy. Againſt this barefaced

Truth

Truth, he brings out a *Chronicle*, written by one *Heath*, which is the beſt Book he has upon his Shelf; I hope he will read it over as often as 'tis ſaid King *Charles* II. did *Hudibras*. Our Doctor has made marvellous Uſe of him; and I could not imagine how he came by him, unleſs ſome *Whig*, out of Malice, had laid it in his Way: For *Heath*'s Character is ſo like his own, that it could not but take with him. *A. Wood* deſcribes his Chronicle thus; *Some Copies have in them the Pictures of the moſt eminent Soldiers in the* Inteſtine War, *which makes the Book valued the more by ſome Novices.* I doubt not Dr. *Grey*'s Chronicle has every one of the Pictures. *A. Wood* proceeds, *Vol.* II. *p.* 295. *This* Chronicle *being moſt compiled from* Lying *Pamphlets, and all ſorts of News Books, there are innumerable Errors therein*, &c. He wrote ſeveral other valuable Tracts, as a *New Book of Loyal* Engliſh MARTYRS *and* CONFESSORS, *who have endured the Pains and Terrors*, &c. *for the Maintenance of the Government in Church and State: Flagellinus*, or, *The Life and Death of the Uſurper* Cromwell; And other ſuch Rarities. Having ſpoken of *Tongue*'s Plot as above, Dr. *Zach.* ſays, *There's too much Evidence upon Record, to be invalidated by ſo conſiderable an Author as our* Crit. Hiſt. I thank him for his good Word, but I wiſh I had not been joined with his Chronicler; for this *too much Evidence* is taken from *Heath*, p. 512. as he quotes him; and Mr. *Echard* in his Preface to the Second Volume, mentions the ſaid *Heath* with the Lord *Clarendon*, Mr. *Sanderſon*, Dr. *Heylin*, *Berlace*, *Salmonet*, and others.

I think I ſhall hardly have Patience with him, when he labours to load the Diſſenters with the Fire of *London*; and his Authority is the *Caveat againſt the Whigs*; which I am never like to ſee but in ſuch Writings as Dr. *Grey*'s. Of *L'Eſtrange*,

who

who is another of his Authorities, a noble Lord told *us enough*, in a Speech in the Houſe of Peers, about the Popiſh Plot, *See Hiſt. Eur. Part* 3. *p.* 85. "Some Perſons, notwithſtanding the many Evi-"dences of the *Plot*, have been induſtrious to re-"vile the King's *Witneſſes*; ſuch a one is *Roger* "*L'Eſtrange*, who now diſappears, being one of "the greateſt *Villains* upon Earth; a *Rogue* be-"yond my Skill to delineate, who has been the "*Bughear* of the Proteſtant Religion, and trac-"ced the King and Kingdom's Evidences, by his "notorious *Scribblings*; and he has endeavoured as "much as in him lay, to eclipſe the Glory of the "*Engliſh* Nation. He is a dangerous rank Papiſt, "proved by good and ſubſtantial Witneſſes; for "which, ſince he has walked under another Diſ-"guiſe, he deſerves of all Men to be *Hang'd*; "and I believe I ſhall live to ſee that be his "Fate."

I endeavour to rid my ſelf of his Authorities as faſt as I come at them; and you ſee how exactly they tally. When I make uſe of ſuch *Greyiſms* as *Metal*, *Inſolence*, *Aſſurance*, and the like, it ſeems ſtrange and grating. I never did before, nor ever will again: For I'll anſwer no more of 'em, nor meddle with no more: But how can one contain, when this unparalell'd Doctor ſtares you in the Face, and charges the Non-conformiſts with burning the City of *London*, p. 172, 173? His wicked Warrant is the impious Author of the *Caveat*; and this he does in direct Contradiction to the King, Lords, and Commons in Parliament aſſembled. I mentioned, *p.* 266. a Saying of the Lord Chancellor *Finch* at Viſcount *Stafford*'s Try-al, *Who can doubt any longer that* London *was burnt by* Papiſts! I have diſcours'd more largely on the Villany of the Charge againſt Proteſtant Diſſen-ters firing the City in the Second Edition of the

Crit.

Crit. Hiſt. and ſhall only add here the Senſe of that great Capital of the *Britiſh* Empire, which *Heylin*, *Echard*, and others, have term'd the Sink of Sedition, Rebellion, &c. This Senſe is declared in a ſolemn Manner, being inſcribed on the *Monument*, one of the nobleſt and moſt regular Columns in the World. The Words about the *Plinth* of the lower *Pedeſtal* are theſe: *This* Pillar *was ſet up in Perpetual Remembrance of the moſt dreadful* Burning *of this* Proteſtant City, *begun and carry'd on by the Treachery and Malice of the* Popiſh Faction, *in the Beginning of* September, *in the Year of our Lord* 1666. *in order to the carrying on their* horrid Plot *for extirpating the* Proteſtant Religion *and* Old Engliſh Liberty, *and introducing* Popery *and* Slavery. On one Side of it was a Latin Inſcription, in which was this Expreſſion, *Sed Furor Papiſticus qui tam dira patravit nondum reſtinguitur.* Both theſe Inſcriptions were eraſed by King *James*'s Order, and tho' reſtored at the Revolution, Mr. *Echard* has again eraſed the *Furor Papiſticus* in his Hiſtory: He prints the firſt Part of the Sentence in the Tranſlation; the Whole running thus; *Tertio die cum jam planè evicerat Humana Concilia & ſubſidia Omnia, cælitus, ut par eſt credere, juſſus ſtetit fatalis ignis & quaqua verſum elanguit.* Mr. *Echard* tranſlates it, "After "three Days, when the fatal Fire had in Appear-"ance overcome all Means of Reſiſtance and "humane Counſels, by the Will of Heaven it "ſtop'd and was extinguiſhed. *Sed Furor Papiſti-"cus.* But Popiſh Fury, which perpetrated ſuch "direful Things is never to be extinguiſhed. That's every Word ſunk. Can any Thing be more apparent than the Complacency of theſe Men to thoſe *Papiſts*, in concealing the Deſtruction committed by their diabolical Incendiaries? How natural is it to them to defend, favour and

carels

careſs them! and I know why but too well. Inſtead of ſpeaking this Monumental Truth, Archdeacon *Echard* affirms roundly, "That after "weighing the Circumſtances, we may ſay that "the Beginning of this dreadful Fire was the "Judgment, and the End of it the Mercy of "Heaven; for neither of them ſeem to have "been the Efforts *of the Treachery and Malice of* "*the Popiſh Faction*, as we read on the *Monument*. The Author of the *Ten Letters* has dealt with him pretty well about the *Presbyterians* burning *of London*, and he will hear more of it elſewhere. In the Interim I will borrow a Word or Two of a MS. I have by me, written by the ſame Gentleman that wrote the Letters. *It is well known* the Papiſts *breed up ſome Perſons here to Learning, and then employ them to write* Pamphlets *and* Hiſtories *under the Name of* Church of Englandmen, *and it is greatly to be ſuſpected that*——— *is ſuch a one; he would never elſe become ſo zealous an Advocate for the* Papiſts, *to excuſe their Villanies, as by his Hiſtory in* Charles IId's *Reign plainly appears.* Whoever bred Dr. *Zachary*, I am convinc'd it was not the *Papiſts*; for let 'em be as wicked as you pleaſe, they are not ſo fooliſh as to lay out a Penny on one who by his Blunders and Aſſurance wou'd do them more harm than good.

Page 173. produces another extraordinary Paſſage. Himſelf commends a *beautiful Paragraph* of mine, as he's pleas'd to call it; but it is a Miracle if it ſhou'd be ſo, conſidering the Subject, King *Charles*'s Diſſimulation with Religion, and his Severity againſt the Diſſenters. Dr. *Zachary* defends in it Mr. *Echard* for extolling that King's Zeal for the Proteſtant Religion at the ſame Time that he knew him to be a *Papiſt*. 'Tis ſuch ſort of Cauſes that this excellent Law Doctor takes in Hand.

He

He abuſes me in the following Quotation, which is maim'd: He has left out *who in direct Oppoſition to the Light of the Goſpel and Nature* would ſet up their arbitrary Wills and temporal Intereſts: He leaves out alſo, *inſtead of Religion and Virtue.* I took that Occaſion to explain my ſelf as to the Clergy I only meant, whenever they were ſpoken of; and that they were not the Reverend, Learned, and Loyal Body of the Church of *England* Divines. I further explain'd my ſelf afterwards. *p.* 275. by naming *Tenniſon, Sharp, Patrick, Sherlock, Fowler, Scot, Calamy, Claget, Cudworth, More, Williams*, &c. To theſe I might have added the living Ornaments of our Proteſtant Church, *Wake, Blackburn, Talbot, Willis, Gibſon, Hoadly*, and innumerable others of ſuperior and inferior Clergy in *London* and the Country, who for Piety, Learning, and Worth, have given a Character to the ſacred Function which all the Proteſtant World revere and rejoice in. But what's this to Dr. *Zachary*, and others of his Temper and Merit! He's here guilty of another Falſity, and ſays he knows who I mean, *Burton, Marſhal, Sterry, Hickeringill*, and *Burnet*; the Libeller herding that great Prelate with ſuch as he treats as Scoundrels; ſome of whom I never heard of.

Becauſe he calls my next Paragraph *beautiful*, I'll repeat it; it contains what Biſhop *Burnet* ſays of the *uſual Diſorders on the 29th of* May *for King* Charles's Nativity *and* Reſtoration; and adds, *on which Day the* ſame Faction *continue to commit the ſame Diſorders, to keep up the ſame Spirit of Tyranny, Eccleſiaſtical and Civil.* We have heard of another Holy-day of theirs in King *James* I.'s Time, and what Work they made of it in the Choir of St. *Paul's*. In the *ſame St.* Paul's *they have ſince told the* ſame *Thing, to keep up the* ſame *Spirit*, &c. There's more Beauty for him, ſince he's ſo taken with it.

I will not leave the *Popiſh Plot*, as *Zachary Grey* has left it; in the Second Edition of the *Critical Hiſtory*, the Deſign of theſe Men to invalidate it, is laid open, by the Writer of the *Ten* Letters to that Author. The Parliament, *A. D.* 1678. RESOLVED, *That there hath been, and is, an* Execrable *and* Helliſh *Deſign, contrived and carried on by* Popiſh *Recuſants, for* aſſaſſinating *and* murdering *the King, for ſubverting the Government, and for deſtroying the* Proteſtant *Religion by Law eſtabliſhed.* Contrary to this ſolemn Reſolution appear the Hiſtorian and his Champion; and why do they labour ſo to give the *Lye* to the Parliament? Dr. *Calamy* tells us, a Bill was brought in to *exempt his Majeſty's* Proteſtant *Subjects* diſſenting *from the Church of* England, *from the Penalties impos'd upon* Papiſts, 25 *Eliz.* It paſt the Houſe of Commons and Houſe of Lords; but the *Faction* ſtole it out of that Houſe before it came to the King. This good Bill being in Agitation at the ſame Time that the *Popiſh Plot* was proſecuted, they would never forgive the Parliament; and *the Court*, ſays *Calamy*, *uſed all their Endeavours to ſave and ſkreen the Plotters.* The Miſchief that has been done by their falſe and impudent Aſſertions, to turn this *Plot* into Ridicule, is apparent in the Incredulity of ſome well-meaning Perſons; and their Lectures of Hereditary Right, together with their Invectives againſt the Revolution, will, I fear, have no good Effect in the End, however they may be now neglected and deſpis'd. Dr. *Zachary* has been prov'd in one Falſity already, for ſaying I had never ſeen a Manuſcript. I have one now before me, which may ſee the Light in Time, relating to the Hiſtory of *England*, which he's very fond of, and in it are theſe Words, *totidem Verbis*: *If the Puniſhment of Dr.* Leighton *for miſtaken Opinions againſt the Church, ſuppoſing them to be miſtaken,*

him, without Malice; and if the Punishment of Dr. Oates *wrongfully, as now fully appears, were* just Severities, *as tender Mr.... seems to think, sure such Punishment would be less severe to him, who wilfully and knowingly publishes* Falshoods *in History, and writes so much for the* Pretender *against our happy Constitution, that I know a Lawyer, if he were* A——y G——l, *would form and maintain a* Ind——t *of* H—— T——n *against him from his History; but I suppose the* G——t *does not think him a Man of such Consequence as to trouble themselves about him.* Much more of the same Kind is in this MS. written by a Gentleman of good Sense and great Experience; who understands our Laws and Constitution, who saw *London* in Flames, and heard the Popish Conspirators try'd, and who has nothing to spirit him in these Matters but his Zeal for the Truth, and the Government, founded on these Principles, and which the Historian and Dr. *Grey* have endeavour'd to villify. That Author has made several curious Remarks on the Lord C——n's History, for my Use: I intended to have added them to the Comparison I made between his Lordship's Collections and *Rushworth*'s, but for Quietness sake only I will forbear. The Zeal I just mention'd is too often taken for Officiousness and Impertinence: Politicks possess some People like Inspiration; and ten Years Study will not teach a Man as much as ten Hours Practice.

Zachary Grey calls his *Scription*, A *Defence*, &c. and when he speaks of a Lampoon of *Dryden*'s against my Lord *Sommers* and Coll. *Sydney*, he says 'twas in *Defence of Truth*, and shou'd not be call'd a *Libel*. He speaks one Word for *Dryden* and two for himself.

Why does he say that all the *sober sensible* Men were *Whigs*, and all the Addressers and Abhorrers, *p.* 180. *Dunces* and *Blockheads*? Indeed I have

heard them called worſe; but I did not expect it from him. He is labouring to prove that my Lord *Shaftsbury* had an *Aſſociation* in his Houſe againſt King *Charles* II. without any Name to it; and I can tell him where there's an Aſſociation againſt King *James* II. with a Million of Names to it.

The greateſt Rarity in *p.* 181. is his bringing a new Authority on the Stage, one *Salmon*, an *Hiſtoriographer*, but by no Means ſo celebrated as Dr. *Salmon* the Quack. This Man he calls one Page after another, *ingenious Author*; but I find his *Ingenuity* conſiſts in juſt ſuch another Libel as Dr. *Zachary*'s, againſt the late Biſhop of *Salisbury*, and certain *Monthly* Hiſtories, publiſhed doubtleſs with a very laudable Deſign, of both Bookſeller and Author, to get a Penny if poſſible, tho' there is nothing elſe to be got by it. This good Man's Works, and the *Caveat againſt the Whigs* are Dr. *Grey*'s Crutches to help him to the End of his Labour. Such Authorities as theſe are below Cognizance and Criticiſm. I will not anſwer a Word to any Thing which I find their Names to; and when one of them, as *Salmon* the *Hiſtoriographer*, calls the Biſhop of *Sarum malicious* and *ignorant*, p. 181. *Zach. Grey* cries out, Oh! the ingenuous Writer! There's a Parcel of 'em, the Lord help us! If there were no better Authors than they are, *Salmon* the Quack's Works would be inеſtimable.

I know very well they will rail againſt the City of *London*, when under its natural Government, as I hope to God it will now be even in our Times. Accordingly, we have ſome Pages in vindicating the Seizure of the City Liberties, and the arbitrary *Quo Warranto*, p. 186, 187. Does there want any Thing to be ſaid in that Caſe, after Sir *Geo. Treby*, Sir *Henry Pollexfen*, Sir *John Holt*, and the greateſt

greateſt Judges and Lawyers in *England*; after the declared Senſe of the Parliament, as to the Illegality of that Seizure, and after the Infamy that attended it! Theſe are the *Diminutive* Writers, who in *Echard*'s high Tone, rake into *Kennels* and *Common Shores*; and indeed there's no other Place fit for them.

In Page 188. the Law Doctor ſhews, that inſtead of not underſtanding Hiſtory and Eloquence, he knows nothing at all. Biſhop *Burnet* had ſaid of my Lord Chancellor *Finch*, *He was long much admired for his Eloquence, but it was laboured and affected, and he ſaw it was much deſpiſed before he dy'd.* To prove that it was not ſo, *Grey* produces his old Friend *Echard* and others, ſaying, He was an *incorrupt Judge.* Bleſs the Soul him! Did not I ſay, *I do not repeat it to depriciate ſo great and worthy a Magiſtrate?* But what's all this to the *Silver Tongue*, the *Cicero*, to *Echard*'s applauding what the Biſhop tells us was ſo much deſpiſed. His Lordſhip's Probity was never in Queſtion, nor his Abilities as a Lawyer; it ſeems his Stile was *laboured and affected*: Mr. *Echard*'s is the very ſame; and good Reaſon why he ſhould call him *Cicero* and *Silver Tongue.* As for *Zachary Grey* he has no Stile at all, and none of theſe Men can diſtinguiſh what is *ſublime*, what *pathetick*, what natural, what pure, in Languguage, from what is affected and laboured. I don't mean ſuch *Diminutives* as Dr. *Zachary*, but the *Silver Tongues* and the *Cicero's* of the Party. He ſays, *p.* 188, I have not ſeen Dr. *Prideaux*'s Character of Mr. *Echard.* I ſay I ſaw it in Print before the Doctor did; and if I had ſeen it a thouſand times I ſhould never have thought the better of Mr. *Echard*'s Hiſtory or his Stile: I am too well acquainted with both, to want any new Knowledge of them. Beſides, Dean *Prideaux* only ſays, Mr. *Echard's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory is the*

beſt of its Kind in the Engliſh Tongue. So it may be; and yet be as far from *Ciceronian* as our Doctor's is.

In the next Page he boldly affirms, that *Paſſive Obedience* and *Non-Reſiſtance* are not ingrafted into the Doctrine of the Church; not into the true Proteſtant Church of *England*, I know they never were, and never will be; but into *Hicks*'s Church, and *Collier*'s Church, into *Higgins*'s Church, *Sachevarel*'s Church, into his Hiſtorian's and his own, they have been ingrafted from the famous *Oxford* Decree, printed in the *Gazette*, 1683, and burnt by the *Common Hangman*, 1710. That *Ingraftment* of mine he affirms is a *Small Miſtake*. Why did he not ſay *Lye*, as he uſed to do, and with the very ſame Reaſon?

Now draws on the moſt horrible Scene that ever was opened in the Chriſtian World, the Murder of the illuſtrious and beloved Lord *Ruſſel*, the Honourable Col. *Sydney*, the worthy Alderman *Corniſh*, with whoſe Blood he drenches himſelf, wipes his Mouth, and cries no Harm. He's all along next the Executioner in theſe Tragedies, applauding and encouraging the dreadful Work; and in Excuſe of ſo many barbarous Murders, he quotes out of *Salmon*, *L'Eſtrange*, and the like, demanding, *If I had ſeen* the Lord *Ruſſel*'s Paper. Yes, yes, I have ſeen it, and read it, and have it by Heart, to the Abhorrence of every Hand that was polluted with his Blood. I have ſeen all the Acts that declared the Death of theſe *Patriots* to be *Murders*. I have alſo ſeen and read the learned Sollicitor General, Sir *John Hawles*'s Remarks upon their Tryals, proving the Illegality and Barbarity of them. All this and much more have I ſeen, to the ſame Purpoſe; as alſo how Mr. *E-*

P. 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196.

chard

chard has cruelly miſ-repreſented the Matter, and is ſupported in it by Dr. *Grey* and his Authors; of which I wiſh they may repent, and be as ſorry for it as they ought to be aſhamed. *'Tis plain*, quoth the Doctor, the Lord *Ruſſel* was in the *Plot*, and that it was no *Sham Plot*. He has but the Parliament, and every honeſt *Engliſhman*, but Fact and Truth againſt him: All which I know he defies, and therefore ſhall not inſiſt upon it.

He calls me, *p.* 197. to *repent of the many Calumnies upon the beſt of Princes and beſt of Men*; and I dare him to prove I ſaid one Word or Syllable againſt the beſt of Men and beſt of Princes: Is there the leaſt Hint to the Diſhonour of King *William*, Queen *Mary*, Queen *Anne* and King *George*? Have not I always obey'd theſe beſt of Princes out of Love as well as Duty? How groſly then does he abuſe me as guilty of Calumnies upon them? For ſure the beſt of Men and beſt Princes can relate to them only in our Hiſtory ſince the Reign of Queen *Elizabeth*.

Page 196. he quotes me; *Sprat*'s Character (as an *Hiſtorian*) *is ſo notorious, that I would not blemiſh the meaneſt Offender on his Authority*. Very true; no more I would not. And for the Reaſon, his giving the *Lye* to my Lord *Ruſſel*'s dying Words. Can it be plainer, than that I mean only his Inſincerity as an Hiſtorian? And to ſhew the Character is falſe, he tells you Dr. *Felton* cries him up as an Orator. I never met with a Mortal ſo Stupid; yet this is he, who accuſes me of *Unjuſt Inferences*.

He then very fooliſhly endeavours to demonſtrate that Col. *Sydney* meant the *Parliament's Side*, by the *Good Old Cauſe, in which he was engaged from his Youth*. Did ever any one ſay he was engaged on the King's Side? He tells us further, out of Lord C—*n*, he was ſent Plenipotentiary to *Swe-*

den

den and *Denmark*; and I further tell him, that he wrote in the State Table Book at *Sweden*,

Manus Hæc Inimica Tyrannis.

But now comes the Cream of all; which is a real and true Character from *John Nalſon*, L.L.D. a Factious Libeller, as is the other with the ſame Letters. *Nalſon*, about the Time of the *Popiſh* Plot, was ſent to Jayl for writing *ſeditious* Pamphlets. An excellent Authority this, and the better for *Zachary Grey*'s Uſe. I never heard of ſo impudent a Falſity as *Nalſon* tells till within this Month. This other Law Doctor ſpeaking of Col. *Sydney*, *He was alſo one in that infamous Commiſſion for that pretended High Court of Juſtice, by which they tried, condemned, and put to Death, one of the moſt excellent Men, and moſt admirable Princes, that ever wore a Royal Diedem.* They will have their Say. *He was not only named in that execrable Commiſſion, but actually was in the Court, and upon the* Bench *with that* Villain *Bradſhaw.* To this Mr. *Echard* ſays directly, *p.* 654. Col. *Sydney* did NOT ACT: Nay, that he *refuſed to act and ſit in Judgment.* I would not have been ſo long upon *Nalſon*, knowing him to be a Falſe, Inſolent, Ignorant Writer, but I find him very often quoted, and much rely'd upon by the ſame Hiſtorian himſelf. As to *Zachary Grey*, L. L. D. he certainly likes him the better for this moſt ſtaring LYE. The Word cannot give Offence, after ſuch Evidence againſt him as Mr. Archdeacon.

Dr. *Zacary* makes *Nalſon* witneſs again in a Paſſage, where, after having vomited a Heap of Filth and Falſhood againſt that noble Perſon, he tells another ſuch a one as he told before: The Tryal was managed with *great Coolneſs and Temper.* Mr. *Echard*, on the contrary, owns his Death was more

more a *Murder* than any of the reſt; *The Hardſhips he met with were greater than any before.* Here his own *Nalſon* again, and his own *Grey* to ſupport him. Sir *John Hawles* tells us, what Methods the perjured Judges and Juries took to ſacrifice theſe State Martyrs to Popiſh Tyranny. *The King's Counſel* pack'd the Jury *. But I conſider I am talking to two or three *Hirelings*, who are not worthy, nor capable of Satisfaction in ſuch a Caſe as Col. *Sydney*'s.

I beg Pardon for troubling the Reader with the following Ciration out of an *Harangue* made by the impious *Nalſon*, on the Cauſe of the *Long Parliament*; which was in ſo ſolemn and publick a Manner vindicated by Sir *Harbottle Grimſton*, Speaker of that Houſe of Commons, who brought in the King, *p.* 203. *In ſhort, this* Old Cauſe *of Mr.* Sydney's *is the Daughter of the Old Serpent, who was for a Reformation in Heaven, and made the firſt Conſpiracy againſt the Almighty Monarch; She is the Mother of* Sedition, Hipocriſy, Perjury, Rebellion, Murder, Rapine, Sacrilege, Revenge, War, Slaughter, Tyranny, Oppreſſion, Slavery, Confuſion and Ruin; *and if theſe Qualifications, and all that can be ſaid that is wicked and impious on this Side* Hell, *which may literally to a Tittle be juſtified againſt her, be not ſufficient to recommend this old* Beldam *to the eternal Deteſtation of all Mankind*, Lucifer, Beelzebub, Satan, *and all the Infernal Crew*, &c. He holds his Breath in one Sentence twelve Lines longer. Here's the Glory of the Party, for Hiſtory, Eloquence, Piety and Charity; here's the Flower of Reaſon and Rhetorick. I often mentioned what ſort of Doctors they were, but had never ſuch an Opportunity of ſhewing it. I doubt not by their Manner but both our Hiſtorian and his Champion envy

* *Remarks*, p. 45. *St.* T. Vol. II.

ſuch

ſuch happy Flights as theſe, and ſet them always before 'em as a Pattern, which muſt be owned to be inimitable. Beſides the Blood that they ſpilt for the Sham *Rye-Houſe Plot*, their profaning the Holy Name of the Almighty, to countenance the Forgery, is extremely terrible and ſhocking. The *Providential Fire at* New-Market: *The Fire at* New-Market, prevented by God's Providence, and the like Terms uſed by the King's Attorney, and by a thouſand Clergy. My Lord of *Sarum*, ſpeaking of Sir *Thomas Armſtrong*'s Death, ſays, *By this Time the Credit of the Witneſſes was ſo blaſted, that it ſeems the Court was afraid the Juries* would not now be ſo eaſy as they had been, and Sir *Thomas* declared *knew of no Plot but the* Popiſh Plot.

I ſhall only repeat what Dr. *Zachary* quotes out of the *Crit. Hiſt.* p. 206. *Biſhop* Burnet *has given us the Character of King* Charles *at large, and I take it to be one of the moſt like and diſagreeable Pictures that ever was drawn.* So I do, and could point out to thoſe Likneſſes; but of what Uſe would that be to him? You might as well ſhew a Picture to the Horſe in *Stocks-Market*. He has Eyes perhaps, but not capable of ſuch Perceptions. There was another Earl that gave a Character of that Monarch beſides the Earl of *Mulgrave*:

Chaſte, Pious, Prudent, &c.
E. of *Roch.*

I have not that Lord's Works by me, and have forgot the reſt.

The Addreſſes *of the* Diſſenters *were ſo* ſhameful, *that ſome of 'em fell little ſhort of Blaſphemy*; Dr. *Zachary*'s fine Reflection, *p.* 210. The Addreſſes of his Faction were ſo ſhameful, that the *Crit. Hiſtorian* publiſh'd two Volumes in *Harley* and Sir *John*'s Time, collected out of thoſe excellent Pieces, which

which were presented to the two Kings, and printed in the *Gazette*; and, says a late Author, *There's not any where else to be met with so much* Fustian, Flattery, false Zeal, Contradiction, foul Language, Execration, Malice, Revenge, Dulness and Nonsense. The *Dunces* and *Blockheads*, so Dr. *Zachary* called them, complimented the King for ruling without Parliaments, seizing the Customs, and keeping up a Standing Army. These Papers were generally drawn up by the Smaller Clergy in the Country, and are equally remarkable for the Sense and for the Language, as may be seen in the History of 'em.

Page 210. he quotes what my Lord of *Sarum* said, *The Bishops that were gained by the Court, carried their Complaisance to a* shameful *Pitch, for they set on Addresses of Thanks to the King, for the Promises he had made of maintaining the Church of* England, *tho' it was visible the Intent was to destroy it.* Of the same Piece with *Echard*'s applauding King *Charles*'s Zeal for the Protestant Religion, when he had told us before he was a Papist. To justify the Infallibilty of the abovementioned Bishops, Dr. *Grey*, in his wonted Way of arguing and inferencing, tells us, the *Addresses of the Dissenters were shameful.* So some of 'em were; and it is well known that they are not infallible. *Tere were high Flights* in some of the *Dissenting Addresses, for which*, says Dr. Calamy, *I could be loth to Apologize, that which most of 'em run upon, was Thanks to the King for the Liberty they had, and a Promise to behave themselves quietly in the Use of it.* Supposing they did carry their Hyperboles too far, is there no Excuse for it? People that come at once out of the Dark into the Light are sometimes almost blinded by the Change. The King had deliver'd 'em out of the Hand of those that had murdered their best Patriots, and tormented and mangled in

the

the most bloody Manner their Fellow Subjects; witness the reverend and learned Mr. *Samuel Johnson*, whose Sufferings are not to be paralell'd in the History of *Nero*, *Domitian*, and the most cruel of the *Roman* Tyrants. They might well be thankfull to have their Dungeons changed into Meeting-Houses, and instead of Jaylors, Informers and Felons, to have the Sweet Society of their Families and Friends. It must be owned the Fathers of our Church have generally abhorr'd that barbarous Treatment of our Protestant Brethren, *Laud*, *Wrey*, *Sheldon*, *Morley*, *Mew*, and some few others excepted. The same Abhorrence of Persecution has appear'd in the *London* Clergy for the most Part, and in the most worthy of the Country Divines, whose Piety, Learning, and Charity, give them a Distinction superior to all Titles and Dignities: But the fatal Rage predominated, and still predominates in the lowest of the rural Priesthood, of whose Intemperance may be truly said, *Lord, forgive them, for they know not what they do.* These are the loudest in a Claim to the *Apostolical Succession*; these are the most constant Declaimers upon the Dignity of their Order; and amid much Ignorance and Folly wou'd extort that Respect which the Wise and Virtuous will never want. We that live in Villages feel these Things, and therefore tho' to talk thus in the World wou'd be impertinent, we who live out of it cannot help telling our Grievance. I have said enough of the *Addresses* from Dr. *Grey*'s Blockheads and Dunces, and shall only add, that if the Dissenters did address the King a little exorbitantly on Occasion of the Indulgence, they never *address'd* Heaven on the Occasion of an Imposture, as others did *in the* Prayer *appointed by his Majesty's Special Command*, to be used in *London* and ten Miles round it, on Sunday the 15th of *Jan.* 1687-8, and throughout

Eng-

England on Sunday the 29th of the ſame Month, upon Occaſion of King *James*'s Queen *Mary* being with Child. Theſe are ſome of the Words of it: *Bleſſed be that good Providence which has vouchſafed us freſh Hopes of* Royal Iſſue, *by our Gracious Queen* Mary: *Strengthen her, we beſeech thee, and perfect what thou haſt begun: Command thy holy Angels to watch over her continually, and defend her from all Dangers and evil Accidents, that what ſhe has conceived may be happily brought forth, to the Joy of our Sovereign Lord the King, the Eſtabliſhment of his Crown, the Happineſs and Welfare of the whole Kingdom, and the Glory of thy Great Name.* Here's mocking of God! A *Popiſh* Prince for the Welfare of a *Proteſtant* Kingdom, and an *Idolatrous* Worſhip to the *Glory* of God's Great Name. The chief Penman of this Prayer was the ſame *Sprat* that wrote the Romance of the *Rye*, and on whoſe Veracity I ſeem'd ſomething ſcrupulous to make much Dependence.

I ſaid, *p.* 328. "'Tis the general Opinion of "the Common People of our Church, that there "is no other Proteſtant Church in the World, but "that all Chriſtendom beſides is made up of Pa-"piſts and Schiſmaticks: This is zealouſly in-"culcated by the inferior Clergy; and I have "the Charity to think many of them are ſo ig-"norant as to know no better, and to believe it." Dr. *Zachary* does not go about to ſhew that thoſe *Inferiors* of the Order do allow the Reform'd of *Geneva*, the *Dutch* Churches, *&c.* to be our *Proteſtant Brethren*, againſt whom I have often heard the moſt bitter Invectives from the Pulpit, but proves it falſe by the ſtrongeſt Argument he has: *His own Say-ſo: This is ſo groſly ſcandalous and ſimple, that it carries its own Confutation along with it.* That is, no Body ever heard a Word ſpoken againſt the *Geneva* Worſhip, the *Geneva* Diſcipline, nay, nor the Ge-

neva

neva Bible, out of the Mouth of any Vicar or Curate from *London* to the Land's-End. This ſurely does not carry its *own Confutation with it.* The Fact is not only known by Man, Woman and Child, but it has been an Obſervation of Foreigners; and what I quote not being written by an *Engliſhman*, will, I hope, have the more Weight in it. He ſays modeſtly and truly enough; *The Government of every* Proteſtant *Kingdom and State ſhould take Care that no Proteſtants who agree in the Eſtabliſhed Doctrine of their reſpective Kingdoms or States, ſhould for their Difference in other Things, be made uncapable of Eccleſiaſtical and Civil Preferment, that there ſhould be a mutual Forbearance of one another in thoſe minute Differences, and no other Terms of Communion impos'd upon any, but thoſe that are the revealed Terms of Salvation. There is no* Reform'd *Nation in the World ſo guilty of this as* England, *&c.* One would not think it neceſſary to ſay a Word in Confirmation of what the Critical Hiſtorian obſerv'd of the Diſpoſition of certain *Churchmen* to all Foreign Proteſtants: Not one of his ſtaunch Ones will diſown it; and I ſhall add a Line or two upon this out of an *Occaſional Paper*, Numb. 2. *The* Fathers of our Reformation *valued themſelves as a principal Branch of the* Proteſtant *Intereſt, and cultivated a ſtrict Friendſhip and Union with thoſe* Abroad, *who agreed in the general Principles of Separation from the Church of* Rome, *tho' they had different Sentiments of ſome particular Doctrines, and choſe another Model of Church-Government, and other Circumſtances of Worſhip: But of later Years, and eſpecially in the* impetuous Clamours *of our Time, the* Church *is made the Term of Diſtinction from all other* Proteſtants, *rather than from* Popery, *the People being taught to ſay,* That 'tis better to be a *Papiſt* than a *Preſbyterian*; *tho' moſt of the Foreign Proteſtants are ſuch.*

How

How the *Hugonots*, the *Dutch*, the *Palatines*, have been treated by us, is no Secret; how they have been ridicul'd and contemn'd. All the *Naturalization* Bills that ever were offer'd to the Parliament, have been conſtantly oppos'd by Dr. *Zachary*'s Party; and the main Reaſon given for it, is the Danger the Church may be in by it. Have not they carry'd the Matter ſo far, as to blame our aſſiſting the *Dutch* Proteſtants, they being Rebels to the King of *Spain*? and of our aſſiſting the *French* Proteſtants, ſee what Archdeacon *Echard* tells us, *p.* 440. *King* Charles, *by aiding thoſe at* Rochelle, *train'd up his own Subjects in the School of* Rebellion, *and at length brought down the* Judgments *of Heaven upon his own Head.* There is not any one Thing that ſeems favourable to the true *Engliſh* Spirit of Liberty, but has been villify'd by the Betrayers of their Country. Thus our Proteſtant Allies Abroad, thus our *Metropolis* the City of *London* at Home, which is called by Mr. *Echard* the Sink of Sedition. *Peter Heylin* wrote a Book entituled, *The Black Groſs*, ſhewing that the *Londoners* were the Cauſe of the Rebellion; and *L'Eſtrange* ſaid, a *Citizen's Skull was the fitteſt Thing in the World to try the Temper of a Soldier's Sword upon.* Theſe are the Glorious Champions of our Religion and Rights; and among theſe, ſhines in a moſt eminent Manner, Dr. *Zachary Grey*, Author of the *Defence*, whoſe laſt Words in his Libel are theſe, which I repeat as my laſt Specimen of his Honeſty, Modeſty, and Underſtanding: *I give you my Word I have not either falſify'd, miſrepreſented, or miſapply'd any one Hiſtorical Fact.* The Lord have Mercy upon him!

FINIS.

FH
MVSEVM
BRITANNICVM

FINIS.

MUSEUM
BRITANNICUM